The pan-Islamic movement in India was dominated by Maulana Mohamed Ali (1878-1931), one of the most remarkable leaders of India's struggle for freedom. Having achieved political prominence in the tumultuous decade following the revocation of Bengal's partition in 1911, the Maulana emerged as the most powerful spokesman of Muslim interests in India and abroad. His influence among his co-religionists was unrivalled and his popularity unmatched. He was also influential in the Congress movement and was a close associate and ally of Gandhi and Motilal Nehru. His presidential address at the 1923 Congress session was one of the most powerful expositions of India's political demands.

Mohamed Ali's personality was as many-faceted as his achievements. He had qualities of wit, enthusiasm, and fantasy that contributed to his immense popularity. He also had a flair for the unorthodox, a freedom of thought and behaviour, and a personal dynamism that evoked widespread response. His speeches and writings also had wide appeal. They were the means of popular mobilization during the massive Khilafat protest in the early 1920s.

The second volume of the Mohamed Ali papers casts fresh light on many aspects of his personality. The period covered is from 1917 to 1919, the years of his continued incarceration. Some of the letters written from Chhindwara and Betul jail contain the most powerful indictment of British rule in India; others offer useful insights into the pan-Islamic ideology and the Muslim concerns over the Khilafat and the future of the Holy Places of Islam. This volume is indeed an important contribution to political and

(Contd. on 2nd Flap)

MOHAMED ALI IN INDIAN POLITICS : SELECT WRITINGS

MOHAMED ALI IN INDIAN POLITICS: SELECT WRITINGS

VOLUME TWO

Edited by

MUSHIRUL HASAN

ATLANTIC PUBLISHERS & DISTRIBUTORS

In memory of Atiq Siddiqui,
a distinguished scholar and friend

Preface

Mohamed Ali (1878-1931) was a central figure in many of the political movements which dominated Indian politics in the early decades of the twentieth century. He was among the founders of the All India Muslim League, one of the key organisers of the Aligarh Muslim University movement, the principal propagandist and fund-raiser for the Medical Mission sent to alleviate Turkish sufferings in the Balkan war, and one of the main architects of the *Anjuman-i-Khuddam-i-Ka'aba*. Above all, he was the most vocal champion of pan-Islamism and the main organiser and leader of the massive Khilafat protest in India. Though often suspected of being in the middle of one conspiracy and on the fringe of another, there was nothing of the conspiratorial or the surreptitious about his interests or actions. His correspondence reveals his unflinching commitment to pan-Islamism and to the defence of his community's interests in India and abroad. He was a relentless critic of the Raj and his letters to British officials offer a most powerful indictment of their policies in India.

Mohamed Ali's personality was as many-faceted as his achievements. He had qualities of wit, enthusiasm, and fantasy. He had a flair for the unorthodox, a freedom of thought and behaviour, and a personal dynamism that evoked widespread response. He was also an exceptionally powerful orator and a brilliant journalist. In fact few orators or political journalists had his combination of qualities: his range of articulate emotions, his capacity for analytical argument, his pathos, fantasy and wit, and his power to marshal all these, through a command over the resources of the language, towards ends clearly discerned and passionately desired.

The publication of Mohamed Ali's writings will no doubt help to illuminate various facets of his personality and enable historians to assess his role in and contribution to Indian politics. These would also help to uncover the ideological roots of the pan-Islamic movement in India and highlight

some of the vital issues and trends which dominated Indian politics from 1906 to 1931. For the first time, we also have sufficient evidence to examine the Muslim community's perception of the role of government in relation to what they considered to be their specific political and religious interests. The attitude towards the Congress movement and other forms of nationalist activity is also revealed in full.

The first volume, published a year ago, dealt with Mohamed Ali's writings and speeches during the years 1906 to 1916. The present one covers the period from January 1917 to December 1919. All materials included in it, except the speech made at the Amritsar session of the Indian National Congress, cover the last three years of Mohamed Ali's incarceration.

The original copies of all correspondence, except where indicated by an asterik, are housed in the Dr. Zakir Husain Library of Jamia Millia Islamia in New Delhi. Besides this vast and important collection, the documents are drawn from the Home (Political) records of the Government of India. Most of these have not been utilised by historians like Judith Brown, Francis Robinson, Gail Minault and David Page even though their accounts examine both the pan-Islamic movement in India and Mohamed Ali's close involvement in its rapid progress. And finally, a couple of letters addressed by Gandhi to Mohamed Ali, published in *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, have been reproduced to provide a researcher easy access to all the relevant materials concerning the Mahatma's efforts to secure the release of the Ali Brothers. Papers drawn from other sources, such as the *New Era* (Lucknow), and *Freedom of Faith and its Price* (London. 1920), are indicated in the footnotes. We are, however, under no illusion that this collection represents anything approaching the last word, even on the limited ground which we have covered. But we hope that the present series, when complete, will help to fill some of the gaps that must certainly be present in any work based upon the materials currently available.

No attempt has been made to effect any considerable changes in the correspondence, for this would have destroyed some of their special features. But some minor alterations were necessitated by the fact that most correspondents varied

so widely in their usage, in their spelling of names, in capitalization and punctuation generally. In a few cases archaic forms of spelling have been replaced by modern ones. For example, Moslem and Muhammadan has been replaced by Muslim, and Muhammadanism and Mohamedanism by Islam. Caliph and Caliphate have been replaced by Khalifa and Khilafat, respectively. Likewise, in the case of some proper names and place names, a uniform spelling has been followed, for in the original the same word has been spelt in different ways. Thus we have preferred Mohammad to Muhammad or Mohammed [except in the case of Mohamed Ali who always signed as 'Mohamed'], Kanpur instead of Cawnpore and Canpur, and Banaras instead of Beneras.

I had expanded the many, sometimes obscure, abbreviations in the previous volume, but have not done so in this work. So abbreviations like Govt., D.C. (Deputy Commissioner), E.A.C. (Extra Assistant Commissioner), and C.P. (Central Provinces) remain unchanged in the text. Likewise, Mohamed Ali's generous use of abbreviations in his diary have been left untouched to preserve the original.

Indian words and phrases freely used by the correspondents (*e.g.*, bazar, satyagraha and hartal) have not been italicised in the text, but a modern version and their meanings appear in the glossary. However, it has been found necessary to italicise Persian, Arabic and some Urdu words because they remain unfamiliar to many of our readers. Many such words like *Haram*, *Jazirat-ul-Arab*, *Anjuman-i-Khuddam-i-Ka'aba* are not italicised in the original.

Three small points have been inserted where either small excisions have been made or a portion of a letter is illegible. In most cases, however, illegible words or sentences are indicated in the footnote. In certain cases, letters referred to in the correspondence have been included as enclosures. The Appendices supplement much of the information relating to Mohamed Ali's release available in his exchange of letters with British officials.

Selecting a balanced collection of documents is no easy task, particularly when the materials are so rich and copious. In taking care not to present an indiscriminate and undifferentiated mass of documents, we have chosen what we consider

to be significant for the understanding of Mohamed Ali's mind and personality, and, in the broader context, his role in the world of politics and education. The selection, however, may not be flawless. Infelicities, even errors, of selection may be noticeable; but these, we believe, are errors of judgement and not the result of bias of any sort.

A strictly chronological arrangement has been adopted in compiling the papers, for it would have been difficult to arrange them by topic. In determining the chronological order, the actual date given on the particular communication has been taken as the basis of classification, irrespective of the time of despatch.

Biographical and explanatory notes are designed only to aid the reader of these papers and neither seek nor are intended to offer any comment upon the text which is likely to be understood and interpreted differently. The length of a biographical note is no measure of the relative importance of the person, but rather an indication of editorial judgement of material most likely to prove useful to readers. The reader may, however, do well to refer to the biographical and explanatory notes in Appendix one of the first volume of Mohamed Ali's writings. He may also consider reading the introduction in the same volume.

In the preparation of this volume, I have received generous support and encouragement from many people and institutions in Delhi. Finance for the research of this and subsequent volumes has been provided by the University Grants Commission. The Jamia Millia Islamia has quite appropriately provided a home for publishing the papers of one of its founders and architects. The university has also sustained the editor, materially and intellectually, by the generosity of its assistance and by the comradeship of its senior and junior members. I am particularly obliged to its Vice-Chancellor, Mr. Anwar Jamal Kidwai, for his consistent help and encouragement.

I am grateful to the librarian and staff of the Zakir Husain Library who offered ready and courteous help. For special thanks I would like to single out Mr. Mahfuz Khan, Mr. Sitwat Rasul, and Mrs. Nigar Nomani. For permission to consult records, I am much obliged to the Director and staff of the National Archives of India.

The very considerable labour of preparing typed copies of the Mohamed Ali papers and of assembling some relevant materials at the National Archives was undertaken by S.H. Rizvi, Reva Pathak, and P. Girija. I am grateful to all of them for this preliminary spadework. I also acknowledge my gratitude to Praveen Sabharwal for his patient and substantial help in seeing the volume through the press. Jigar Mohammad has put in much effort in preparing the index.

Nehru Memorial Museum and Library
Teen Murti House
New Delhi-110011

September 1983 M.H.

Abbreviations

C.I.D.	Central Intelligence Department
CP	Central Provinces
D	Deposit
DC	Deputy Commissioner
D of I	Defence of India
EAC	Extra Assistant Commissioner
Encl	Enclosure
EUR	European
f.n.	Footnote
Govt.	Government
G of I	Government of India
I.C.S.	Indian Civil Service
JMI	Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi
L.A.	Local Administration
L.G.	Lieutenant-Governor
M.A.O.	Mohammedan Anglo-Oriental College, Aligarh
MAP	Mohamed Ali Papers
MSS	Manuscript
NAI	National Archives of India, New Delhi
NML	Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, New Delhi
Poll.	Political
P.W.D.	Public Works Department
Rs	Rupees
Supdt.	Superintendent
UP	United Provinces

Contents

Mohamed Ali in Indian Politics

1. To F.S.A. Slocock

Chhindwara
2 January 1917

I had the honour to address on the 18 October last a representation to the Local Administration through you on the subject of my 'subsistence allowance'[1] and the travelling expenses of my wife and children, and to address another letter to you on the 24th October requesting that in view of the fact that my wife and children intended to leave Chhindwara soon my earlier request for a decision by the end of the month may be construed as confined to the subject of the travelling expenses only, and that the decision on the subject of the 'subsistence allowance' which was not equally urgent in point of time and which it would not be convenient perhaps to give quite so soon may be communicated subsequently.[2]

In reply to these representations I was informed through the Deputy Commissioner on 25 October that the orders of the Government of India were being obtained on my application for an increase in the monthly allowance.[3]

On November 13 the Deputy Commissioner wrote to me again saying that he had been asked to make some enquiries from me with reference to the members of my family who depend on me for support, and the domestic establishment that I had to maintain during my internment. The information needed was furnished the same day, as the officiating D.C. desired to deal with the matter under reference before handing over charge of his office to his successor.[4]

Apart from the sanction of a special grant of Rs 250 to meet the expenses in connection with sending my family away from Chhindwara, of which intimation was given to me through the D.C. in November last, I have heard nothing further since I furnished the information which Government required about the members of family who depend on me for support and the domestic establishment I have to maintain

1 See Mushirul Hasan (ed.), *Mohamed Ali in Indian Politics : Select Writings*, vol. 1, p. 285.

2 Mohamed Ali to Slocock, 24 October 1916, L 2661, MAP (6).

3 This letter is not traceable.

4 Mohamed Ali to A.E. Mathias, 13 November 1916, in Hasan (ed.), *op. cit.*, *i*, pp. 294-5.

during my internment.[5] I presume the information furnished by me had to be conveyed to the Government of India whose orders, as I was informed on 25 October, were being obtained. May I now request you to invite the attention of that Government to this matter and request it to treat it as of considerable urgency to me. Insufficient as the subsistence allowance had proved to be since the time it became the sole means of support for me and my family about this time last year, it is all the more inadequate now that I have to maintain two separate establishments, one for myself and my mother here, and another for my wife and children and others dependent on me for support at home. I am compelled to confess that I have had to borrow money for some time past to meet the ordinary household expenses, and during the last two months this necessity has increased both in urgency and extent.

I, therefore, trust that an early decision would be arrived at by the Government of India, and that my subsistence allowance would be increased to a more reasonable figure in conformity with my financial circumstances which have completely changed since government was first pleased to sanction an allowance for my subsistence in June 1915.

5 *Ibid.*, p. 295, f.n. 1.

2. To E. Batchelor

Chhindwara
15 January 1917

I was shocked to find yesterday that a responsible officer like you was betraying a confidence that the Government had placed in you when appointing you the censor of our correspondence. I have learnt definitely, though quite unexpectedly, that you have openly talked about a private letter of mine from Maulana Abul Kalam Azad to people who had no concern with the matter, and what is more you have made statements which placed my character and the character of my universally respected friend who wrote the letter in the worst of lights.

Surely you must have known that you had been appointed the censor of my correspondence and not a censor of my morals—a position which I doubt if you or any other could justly hold.

From what I came to hear I suspect that you had formed an absolutely wrong impression of the letter in question. I do not suppose that your knowledge of Urdu qualifies you to take in the niceties of the language, especially of the language used by a writer who is not only a divine of great eminence and learning, but also one of the greatest living writers of Urdu.[1] From the intimacy of our relations I can well understand that in reply to my own playful reference to the youthfulness of his appearance he may have written to me in a bantering tone which a mere stranger like yourself, even if otherwise qualified, may fail to interpret correctly. Nevertheless, that is no reason why you should publish your impressions formed from reading a correspondence which had been placed in your hands in the strictest confidence.

I would request an early reply as I wish to place the matter before the Chief Commissioner.[2]

1 In 1904, Azad launched the *Lisan us-Sidq*, a journal devoted to the progress of Urdu and social reform. He served as editor of *An-Nadwa* (1906-1908) of Lucknow and of the *Vakil* of Amritsar before publishing his famous journal, *Al-Hilal*, in Calcutta on 12 July 1912. During his internment in Ranchi from March 1916 to January 1920, Azad worked on his *Turjuman al-Quran*.

2 Batchelor wrote: "Dear Sir: I have received yours of January 15. It is a letter to which I am surprised that you should expect I should reply". Batchelor to Mohamed Ali, 19 January 1917, MAP. Shaukat Ali, on the other hand, wrote to the Chief Secretary on 16 January protesting against Batchelor's attitude. See L 2858, MAP (7).

3. To Benjamin Robertson[1]

Chhindwara
23 January 1917

I learnt with painful surprise on the 14th that the contents of a private letter addressed to me by a very intimate friend of mine, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad Saheb, who is at present interned at Ranchi in Bihar, was made known by Mr. Batchelor, who scrutinizes our correspondence, to a gentleman here who has no concern with our affairs nor with the censorship of our letters. As the letter in question was withheld by Mr. Batchelor when submitted to him in the ordinary course on the 7th instant, and he subsequently informed me on the 12th instant that it had been sent to you, and again on the 13th that he had been directed to withhold it, obviously only he or you could verify the statement of the gentleman who referred to its contents as divulged to him by Mr. Batchelor. By now a good many people here have become privileged to know them, and, had I not come to hear of them so unexpectedly, perhaps the only person from whom the contents of a letter addressed to him would have been kept secret would have been the unfortunate addressee himself.

I need hardly tell you how dishonourable society considers the practice of looking into the contents of private letters addressed to others, and that only the supreme necessity of maintaining the safety of the State makes such a practice tolerable. During the long period of our internment here and elsewhere our letters have been submitted to the scrutiny of quite a large number of persons as censors or interpreters for the censors, and except in our case here, where a severe warning was administered to the person concerned by the Deputy Commissioner when he came to know that our letters were being made a public property to his subordinate official,[2]

1 Benjamin Robertson was educated in Aberdeen University and Balliol College before joining the Indian Civil Service in 1885. He held several positions in the Central Provinces before assuming charge as Chief Commissioner in 1912.

2 This refers to Mohamed Ali's complaint against Ishtiak Ali. See Mohamed Ali to S.M. Chitnavis, 23 January 1916 in Hasan (ed.), i, p. 237 and f.n. 4.

we have never before had the least occasion to complain that the confidence placed in the censors or their subordinates who interpreted our letter for them had been betrayed. In fact quite a number of censors have told us how unpleasant they found the task of having to look into our private and domestic correspondence, but that they could not help doing it, howsoever disagreeable it may be, as a duty imposed on them by their Government. This makes the revelation that even so responsible an officer as Mr. Batchelor betrayed the confidence reposed in him all the more painful and astounding.

As I have already stated, I was not in a position to verify the information I received on the 14th instant, and accordingly the very next day wrote to Mr. Batchelor himself a letter copy of which I attach here. If he had not divulged the contents of the letter in question to anyone not officially concerned with our correspondence, nor made defamatory statements regarding the moral character of my greatly respected friend Maulana Abul Kalam Azad Saheb and myself he could have had no difficulty in telling me that the information I had received was incorrect, nor should he have had the least hesitation in doing so. What he has, however, seen fit to do lends strength to the suspicion that he has in fact done what amounts to a distinct breach of confidence and is also defamation of character. He is clearly evasive and obviously does not desire to commit himself to any statement at this stage. I need say little about it as his letter—a copy of which also I send herewith—will itself make it plain enough.[3]

We have been interned admittedly in the interests of public safety, and obviously not in the interests of our private morality. As I am not aware of the entire contents of the letter in question which my informant tells me was 7 or 8 pages long, I cannot say how it affected the defence of India or the maintenance of public safety. But if it contained nothing more than what I am informed Mr. Batchelor has divulged, it appears that Mr. Batchelor is not content with being the censor of our mail but would also like to arrogate to himself the position of a censor of our morals. With regard to this I need hardly say that I have no desire to accept Mr. Batchelor as such, nor do I imagine would Government consider him, or, for that matter

3 The summary of this letter is on p. 3, f.n. 2.

any other person, as capable of discharging such an unusual and extraordinary duty.

This much, however, I may say that I cannot believe that the Maulana could have written to me anything that was likely to affect the defence of India or the public safety adversely. We have been corresponding very regularly and not in a single instance has a letter of his to me or mine to him been withheld before this. For some time the Maulana has himself been in the same position as we, and his letters are subjected to a similar censorship. As I told Mr. Batchelor, and as he himself must have noted, the letter in question also had been submitted to the scrutiny of the censor at Ranchi and duly passed by him. That makes me suspect all the more that perhaps it has been misinterpreted or misunderstood, and would therefore request that Govt. should get it translated by a competent person.

The portion of its contents that has been divulged and the interpretation placed by Mr. Batchelor thereon gives added strength to this suspicion, for any person of even ordinary commonsense can well understand that the writer of that letter who is a religious leader of great eminence and has hundreds of thousands of disciples all over India and other admirers who await with some impatience now the publication of his monumental commentary on the Holy Quran,[4] would not dream of writing an immoral letter when he knew that it would have to be read by at least two or three strangers as official censors and interpreters before it reached the addressee, even if one who is held in so much veneration all over India—and deservedly so—felt inclined to indulge in such an unworthy pursuit.

Not long ago I sent a box of cigars to the Maulana Saheb, and playfully wrote to him that when he smoked them they would remind him of me, quoting in this connection a well-known couplet from a classical metrical love-story in Urdu wherein the heroine writes to her lover just when she is about to make an end of her life that she is all the same preparing some *pan* [betel-leaf] for the next day for him as usual so that there may be something for him to remember her by. Having

4 His *Tarjuman al-Quran*, an unfinished Urdu rendering of and commentary upon the Quran.

quoted it I added that the couplet was not altogether applicable as the *pan* were to form a momento of the fair heroine while the cigars in this instance would be the momento of a big burly bearded fellow like myself. The quotation, I continued, would have been more appropriate if the cigars had been sent along with the verses by one so fair and young and handsome as the Maulana, alluding here to his extremely youthful appearance. I can well understand that in his reply also the same playful tone may have been maintained and he may have pretended to commiserate for a widower like myself interned in such unlovely surrounding as the Gondwana of Chhindwara which is so unlike the fair province of Berar. Surely it is bad enough that correspondence of so intimate a nature should have to be pried into by total strangers ; but one may put up with it if the State considers it necessary in the interests of its safety. That such correspondence should be misunderstood by people whose acquaintance with Urdu is, to say the least, not quite intimate, is perhaps inevitable. But that totally wrong impressions, the extreme probability or at least the distinct possibility of which should have been apparent to one so little acquainted with Urdu as Mr. Batchelor, should be published to all and sundry in a most defamatory manner is an outrage that cannot be tolerated. Little did I dream when quoting from an Urdu lyric that the couplet would lead to such gross attacks on my morals and little could my eminent and universally respected friend the Maulana could have suspected that his playful reference to the ugliness of the Gonds[5] and the greater beauty of the people of Amraoti[6] would be the talk of the town and the subject of lively discussion in the market-place all through the ignorance and inclination to gossip and scandal-mongering of a responsible officer in whom the Government had reposed great confidence. My language may appear to the Chief Commissioner as very strong : but I would assure

5 The Gonds form the largest tribe of Madhya Pradesh, being concentrated in Chhindwara, Betul, Seoni and Mandla districts. According to the Census of 1921, they were at one time a dominant race in this part of India and the name Gondwana—sometimes given to portions of this state—is derived from them.

6 A district of Berar with an area of 4,754 square miles and a population of 809,499 in 1901. The Amraoti town was the headquarter of the Berar administration and was the principal cotton market in Berar.

him that it expresses my great indignation at such a strange discovery but too poorly.

Believing that Mr. Batchelor has not only indulged in the risky pastime of scandal-mongering to the defamation of my esteemed friend and myself, but has also betrayed the confidence reposed in him by Government. I deemed it advisable not to take such action as even an interned person is entitled to take in the defence of his character and reputation before bringing it to the notice of the head of the local administration and awaiting its action in the matter.[7] I have already given an opportunity...*

7 On 4 February and on 14 March, Mohamed Ali repeated his complaints to the Chief Secretary and the Chief Commissioner. 'His (Batchelor) conduct', wrote Mohamed Ali on 14 March, 'is daily growing more and more provocative and openly hostile to us......I trust the claims of justice will outweigh all other considerations, and steps will be taken to prevent our daily harassment'.

*The remaining portion of the letter is missing.

4. To F.S.A. Slocock*

Chhindwara
29 January 1917

I thankfully acknowledge the receipt of the new orders of the Govt. of India regarding our subsistence allowance which have been communicated to us by the Deputy Commissioner of Chhindwara.[1]

I understand that although only I had applied to Government for an increase in my subsistence allowance of Rs 250 a month fixed at a time when I had other sources of income left

*Home Poll. A, Proceedings, January 1917, 425-426, NAI.

1 This refers to the sanction of an allowance of Rs 350 to Mohamed Ali and Rs 300 to Shaukat. Mohamed Ali was also given a lump sum of Rs 250 to meet the expenses incurred on account of illness in his family. The sanction was given on 15 January 1917 with effect from 1 December 1916.

to me wherefrom to provide for the needs of those members of my family who depended on me for support, and now found wholly inadequate when those other sources had long ceased to exist, the Govt. of India have been pleased to reconsider their decision regarding the subsistence allowance of my brother, Mr. Shaukat Ali, also, who had submitted a representation to Govt. on the subject on 6 July 1915 from Lansdowne, and to sanction with effect from 1 December last an allowance of Rs 600 a month for the two of us to be shared by us equally or divided into two portions of Rs 250 and 350 instead of the allowances of Rs 100 and 250 each which had respectively been sanctioned in June 1915 for my brother and myself. I also understand that Govt. expects my brother to consider the increased allowance of Rs 250 or 300 as adequate in view of the fact that he has also been drawing from the public treasury, in addition to his allowance, the sum of Rs 150 per mensem as pension for his past services, which he will still continue to draw over and above the allowance sanctioned for him.[2]

I further understand that in view of the fact that my family had left Chhindwara on 1 November last and that my allowance has been increased from a date a month subsequent to their departure, the Govt. of India has been pleased to sanction the payment to me of a lump sum of Rs 250 to meet the expenditure already incurred by me on account of illness in my family which precipitated their departure from Chhindwara.

While thankful to Government for the reconsideration of their previous orders, I hope it will not be deemed importunate if I request them to consider this matter a little further. Compared with the loss of our liberty in other respects the loss of our ability to earn such livelihood as we may be

2 The Ali Brothers were at first given an allowance of Rs 250. In 1916, Mohamed Ali asked for an increase. On 10 August 1917, Shaukat Ali represented that owing to internment he and his brother had sustained severe business losses, and on 5 December 1917 he wrote again on this point and also on the inadequacy of the subsistence allowance. On 12 January 1918, however, they were told that government could not accept responsibility for business. But the Ali Brothers continued to complain of their financial difficulties and the growing needs of their families. On 10 January 1918, the government agreed to an enhanced allowance of Rs 450 to Mohamed Ali and Rs 350 to Shaukat Ali. For further details, see Home Poll. A, June 1918, 359-360, NAI.

qualified to earn and the sanction by Govt. of inadequate allowances for the subsistence of ourselves and our families, and even the possible loss of some of the capital we had invested in our respective business are very minor matters indeed. Apart, however, from feeling the unpleasantness of submitting representations to Government regarding such matters, we are extremely reluctant to become a burden on the tax-payers of our country, and if that cannot be averted, we are ourselves most anxious to make it as light a load as possible.

However, as the Government have explained that in fixing the allowance of a detenu they take into consideration his rank in life, the standard of comforts and conveniences to which he was used before internment, the number and needs of those who depend upon him for support and the sources of income still left to him, I deem it necessary to say that increased as our allowances have been from a total sum of Rs 350 to Rs 600, they are even now far from adequate for our needs.

When submitting my representation on 18 October last I refrained from naming any sum, as I thought that Government would be in possession of all the necessary facts that should guide them in fixing an increased sum as my allowance. It, however, appears that those particulars were not before Govt. at the time they issued the revised orders, and I am, therefore, constrained to set down a few of them to enable the Govt. to arrive at a decision in the light of facts.

During my stay at Oxford from 1898 to 1902 I spent Rs 28,000 which averages Rs 600 a month, the allowance now jointly fixed, in addition to my brothers' small pension of Rs 150, for both of us and our fairly large families.

When I entered life as a bachelor in 1902, my starting salary as the officer-in-charge of Education in the State of Rampur was Rs 300, which was no doubt better than its face value for a man who lived at home in a joint family where he had not to maintain a separate establishment. As this amount was inadequate for my needs I left the service of the State after a year with the permission of His Highness the Nawab and found employment in Baroda. While there I was offered the highest post in the Jaora State. Sir Michael

O'Dwyer, who was then the Agent to the Governor-General in Central India, strongly backing up by His Highness the Nawab's repeated offer, which, in spite of my anxious desire not to appear unwilling to gratify him even after so much pressure, I was unable to accept, as I was then about to commence publication of the *Comrade*.[4] I do not at this date remember the exact figure of the salary offered to me in addition to a furnished residence and horses and carriages, but I do not think it was less than Rs 1000 a month.

In view, however, of the financial needs of the *Comrade*, I did not draw a similar amount as my own remuneration, and in fact spent on that publication and my Urdu daily newspaper, the *Hamdard*, considerable funds of my own. But my expenses in Calcutta and Delhi did not average much below Rs 700 in spite of the fact that I did not pay out of my drawings for my furnished residence and horse and carriage and such other conveniences as electric lights and fans. The *Hamdard* involved me in even greater initial losses than the *Comrade*, but it had turned the corner, so to speak, financially some time before I was interned after the change from an unfamiliar script had increased its circulation as expected. At the time of my internment it was paying me back for my past losses (exclusive of my emoluments as editor) at the rate of about Rs 1500 per month, a rate that was by no means stationary but increasing from day to day.

While at this subject I may perhaps be permitted to state that when I left India in 1913 in connection with, among other matters, the Kanpur mosque,[5] I spent no less than Rs 10,500 in the course of 3½ months.

I have already supplied to Government a list of those of my relatives who depend on my support as also of the domestic establishment I have to maintain.[6] I may only add that my two elder children are now grown up, and even if I can dispense with the services of an English governess for

3 See Hasan (ed.), *i*, p. 285.

4 *My Life : A Fragment*, pp. 31-2.

5 The reference is to the Kanpur mosque incident. For Mohamed Ali's correspondence and speeches on the subject, see Hasan (ed.), i, pp. 151-60.

6 *Ibid.*, pp. 294-5.

their education (whose salary was Rs 100 per mensem while we were at Delhi) I cannot avoid other expenditure such as young ladies of their age must entail for keeping up the decencies of life.

If I required Rs 600 a month at Oxford and Rs 300 a month soon after graduating and while I was still a bachelor of 23 years, I surely need after 15 years something more than Rs 350 for myself and my wife and 4 children, two of whom are grown up, and a nephew whom I supported at Delhi, in addition to the mother to whom I owe almost everything in life.

I therefore trust that at least Rs 500 a month will be fixed as subsistence allowance for myself and my family.

I have no other source of income left now, and may add that I have to pay house rent for my Press at Delhi and keep a clerk there to look after it, which costs me no less than Rs 60 a month, in addition to the interest on borrowed capital. I have not included any part of these liabilities in the amount of monthly allowance for which I apply.

Let me add that when I submitted my representation on 18 October last I asked my brother also to do the same. But he told me that he already once brought to the notice of Government the inadequacy of his allowance of Rs 100 a month in addition to his pension of Rs 150, although it should not have been necessary to do so, considering that he had been a public servant for 17 years before he retired at his own request (and in fact, had to obtain the sanction of the Secretary of State as a special case before he could retire), on a pension of Rs 150. It was within the knowledge of Govt. that he was drawing when he was only 39 years old Rs 500 as salary and allowances averaging Rs 100 a month, and that he had assured prospects of much higher emoluments. When the annuity of Rs 150 per mensem which he had earned through his meritorious services extending over a period of 17 years during the best part of his life was deducted out of the allowance originally contemplated for each of us, and his allowance was therefore fixed at Rs 100 only, he pointed out to Govt. that this annuity had nothing to do with his internment allowance, and that, in any case, even the allowance *plus* the pension were obviously inadequate for the

subsistence of himself and his family. The reply of the Govt. to this representation was that they did not consider an increase in his allowance called for, and he was in consequence loth to write on such a painful subject again. Now, however, that Government have on their own motion reconsidered the matter, I venture to say that even an increase from Rs 100 to Rs 300 will prove inadequate for his needs and the needs of those whom he has to support, among the latter being three sons[7] and two daughters[8], and two nephews[9] who were employed in his business. (One of these is now here suffering from tubercular scrofula, and unable to undertake any business on his own account, even if our internment did not adversely affect access to other avenues which it had itself necessitated). His boys must now be sent to Aligarh where their education would cost him little short of Rs 150 a month, and even now when two of them are here with him, only because he cannot afford to keep them at Aligarh (where the eldest had been for some time before our internment) private tutors have to be engaged for their education.

I may perhaps also add that when in 1911 he decided to devote himself more thoroughly to public work, and obtained furlough for the purpose of touring in India as the (unpaid) Secretary and fellow-worker of the Aga Khan, it became quite apparent to all who were acquainted with the standard of living he then maintained that his furlough pay would be wholly inadequate for his needs. It was then that the Nawab of Rampur most generously showed his appreciation of Mr. Shaukat Ali's somewhat reckless self-denial by treating his family as State guests and sending to the late Begum Saheba Shaukat Ali Rs 300 every month for their board.

It is true that since he became the Secretary of the *Khuddam-i-Ka'aba* Society in 1913, Mr. Shaukat Ali has renounced many of the comforts and conveniences to which he

7 Shahid Ali, Zahid Ali (d. 1967), and Abid Ali (d. 1968).

8 Uzra and Sultana. The former was married to Usman Ali (1895-1975), a nephew of the Ali Brothers.

9 Khurshid Ali who inherited Mohamed Ali's property ; the other nephews referred to were Farooq Ali and Usman Ali. The latter worked with the *Humdard* for some years, but was mainly associated with the Rampur State.

was used to a greater degree than even I had been. (This was only natural considering that his income, even before he established his cotton press and ginning factory at the cost of something like 1½ lakhs, was about a thousand rupees a month and therefore much greater than mine before the *Hamdard* became so paying a concern). But he has a larger family than mine and has always supported many more relations than I did or could afford to do. (It was entirely on the strength of his own assistance backed to some extent by our ancestral property and a loan from the State that I had been sent to Oxford ; and before his internment he was supporting our mother and two of our nephews, the latter of whom he has still to support, though he now does it out of his capital).

I have said nothing about his business, though his internment has caused him far greater loss in business than it has caused to me. In his case the interest on borrowed capital comes to something like Rs 10,000 a year, and the profits of his business which internment turned into losses, over and above the interest that had to be paid, would otherwise have been no less than 20,000 rupees a year.

Taking all these facts into consideration, the least that Mr. Shaukat Ali needs would be an amount equivalent to what I have named as necessary for myself, and since he was another source of income also which I have not, namely, his pension of Rs 150 a month, he should get by way of allowance during internment another Rs 350 per month. That is to say, our joint allowance in addition to his pension should be at least Rs 850 instead of Rs 600 as now fixed and Rs 350 as originally sanctioned when I had my income from the *Hamdard* also wherewith to support my family.

I trust this representation will be forwarded to the Govt. of India with the recommendation of the local Govt.[10]

10 Mohamed Ali was informed that 'in view of the increased allowance recently sanctioned by the government of India, the Chief Commissioner does not propose to address the Government of India in the matter'.

5. From Ziauddin Barni[1]

Theosophical School
Kanpur
31 January 1917

I am sorry I could not write to you earlier. I cannot but hope that this letter would find you in good health, in spite of the severities of weather.

I was in Lucknow during the National Week, as they call it. It was a week of life and enthusiasm, and every man was feeling happy because he thought that he had the opportunity to feel the pulse of national life without which a nation can have no respect and honour. I was present at the session of the Muslim League at the second day's sitting.[2] Mrs. Naidu was asked to speak on the resolution for self-government.[3] Sir James Meston was fortunately there.[4] Besides other things she referred to your absence in her melodious but pathetic voice. This evoked prolonged cheers and clappings of hands. That enthusiasm was worth seeing. May this fact give you some consolation that your co-religionists have not forgotten you, and that you are always within them.[5]

1 Ziauddin Barni was a follower of Annie Besant with close links with the Theosophical Society. He first met Mohamed Ali in 1912. His acquaintance' with the Maulana began in that year. When asked to write a sketch of Mohamed Ali's life. Ziauddin wrote: 'I feel I am not up to the work'. Ziauddin Ahmad Barni subsequently agreed to write a biography which was anonymously published by Messrs Ganesh & Co, Madras. Barni to Mohamed Ali, 21 November 1917, MAP. In 1947, he migrated to Karachi where he edited *Kitabi Duniya*. His best known publication is *Azmat-i-Rafta*, a collection of biographical sketches with reminiscences of the author.

2 The session was held in Lucknow on 30-31 December 1916. M.A. Jinnah delivered the presidential address.

3 See resolution II in S. Pirzada (ed.), *Foundations of Pakistan: All-India Muslim League Documents 1906-1947* (Karachi, 1969), vol. I, p. 379.

Sarojini Naidu said that self-government was in the hands of the people, and Hindu-Muslim cooperation was 'an augury that the time was not far off when they would realize their dream of home rule'.

4 The Lieutenant-Governor was accompanied by Verney Lovett and L. Curtis.

5 The Muslim League passed a resolution on the release of the Ali Brothers. It was proposed by Mazharul Haq and seconded by Syed Nabiullah.

Mrs. Naidu was kind enough to visit our school. Oh, what a charming and mellow voice she has ! She talked for a short time before the students and recited the Hindu, Muslim and Parsi prayers in a very sweet manner. I was introduced to her later on, and she was very glad to hear that I had worked with you. She has sent her love to you.

A few days ago she was again in our midst. This time she had stayed with the Head Master of our school. At breakfast I also was one of the guests. She is a keen admirer of Iqbal ; but she said Hali[6] was devoid of poetic charm. And from this view I respectfully differed from her.

I intend to appear this year in the M.A. examination (Previous) in Persian. I am not very optimistic about any result, for it is only a few days ago that I began to study the prescribed books.

Ghulam Husain intends to publish a weekly paper of his own.[7] I heard it from Ghulam Haider who happened to be in Kanpur a few days ago. I heard from him that Ghulam Husain has shaken off his indolence and procrastination. I know that he is an ideal journalist, but he is not, in my opinion, a smart editor.

I will shortly send you a tin of cigarettes.

Expecting your *ghazals*.

6 Altaf Husain Hali (1837-1914), a distinguished Urdu poet and author of *Yadgar-i-Ghalib* and *Hayat-i-Javed*, a biography of Syed Ahmad Khan. One of his best known poems is 'The Ebb and Flow of Islam', an eloquent instance of the nostalgia for the departed glory of the Muslims.

7 This refers to the publication of the *New Era* on 7 April 1917. The Government took serious note of the proposed publication of the *New Era* which was to support self-government for India and Hindu-Muslim unity and aim at 'the encouragement of a new type of public worker of ample mould and wide courageous outlook'. Ghulam Husain reported to Mohamed Ali of his success in raising Rs 8,000 for the paper, but regretted the opposition of Syed Wazir Hasan and his 'rich circle' to his scheme. 'The existing law apparently is', he continued, 'that no dog should be allowed to bark unless he takes his cue from the M Palace (reference to the Raja of Mahmudabad) but there are dogs and dogs and those of the pestilent breed like to bark just when they are told to be silent'. Weekly Report of the Director, Central Intelligence (10 March 1917), Home Poll. B, March 1917, 625-628, NAI.

6. To Mazharul Haq*

31 January 1917

About three months ago I wrote to you at some length while inviting you here to advise me about my case.[1] I had thought that the Muharram holidays would furnish you the leisure that you could devote to us without sacrificing so many half thousands per day. But you had already made an engagement, I believe, with the D.P.I. of your province, to discuss the Patna University constitution, and could not come. I then thought that Jinnah would be returning from Calcutta after the 18th November last and wrote to him care of Fazlul Haq to drop here on his way back for a couple of days.[2] But I learnt from F.H. that Jinnah had not gone to Calcutta at all[3], so I remained without the legal consultation that I sought. I could have invited you before Christmas, but I had to guard against one thing. It is not unoften that when a gulf has been formed between the rulers and the ruled, and the former are reluctant to concede the demands of the latter, they come to believe that all that they need do is to come down with a heavy hand on one or two prominent men among the latter in order to wean off the rest not only from them but from the hopes and aspirations that sustain them and their self-respect. I know no offence of mine of which any true Muslim in this country has not been unceasingly guilty, not to mention offences to which all patriotic Indians of whatever creed would gladly plead guilty. That I was interned while most of the rest are still free can be explained, in the absence of any light thrown by Government on the reasons that led them to take this step, by the fact that, while they came under that fierce light that beats upon all public men only when they came on the public platform, I, as the editor of an English weekly and an Urdu daily, was all the twenty-four hours of every one of the thirty days of the month and all the twelve

*This letter to Mazharul Haq was withheld. Batchelor to Mohamed Ali, 20 February 1917, L 3032, MAP (7)

1 Mohamed Ali to Mazharul Haq, 21 October 1916, in Hasan (ed.), I, pp 288-291.

2 Mohamed Ali to Jinnah, 1 December 1916, *Ibid.*, p. 305.

3 Fazlul Haq to Mohamed Ali, 23 November 1916, *ibid*, p. 307.

months of the year on the stage and in the doubtful enjoyment of the limelight. Well, be that as it may, it seemed clear after the action taken by the Govt. of India last year over my telegram to you when you were at Bombay, that they imagined that I was the real wire-puller and the rest of us mere puppets that danced as I pulled the strings from this safe and secluded retreat of the political recluse. It was on this account that I purposely refrained from inviting you before the last Christmas so that none might say that the emphasis to which my old friend Sir James Meston had such a strong objection, but which, I felt sure, would receive an access of strength from the very fact that he had taken such an unusual step to prevent it, was my handiwork. (I was never a very modest youngman, *Bhayya*, but when I have been reduced to such shifts to unburden myself of the greatness thrust upon me even I come to think I must blush out of modesty).

Your Lucknow saturnalia is now well over. The captains and the kings have long ago departed. I have no desire to express my opinion about what you did or omitted to do during that crowded week, even if I had been left the freedom to do so, which, as you know, I have not been. Nor would my opinion, even if expressed, can affect what is past and gone. So I can safely invite you now to take the earliest opportunity to come here and advise me as to what I can and should do, and I hereby do so.

You know how I was interned at Rampur through the clear intervention of the U.P. authorities.. When, in consideration of my shattered health, which Rampur only made worse at the time, His Highness annulled the order of internment, after asking the Govt. and being assured by them that they did not object to it, and I returned to Delhi with Dr. Ansari who was going to share rooms with me in a nursing home at Mussoorie where I intended to stay for the hot weather, Hailey saw to it that the cancellation of His Highness's order of internment was made absolutely ineffective, and ordered the internment not only of myself but also of old Shaukat who had never taken part in any political movement even after retiring from the public service, and was giving to my business in my absence from Delhi whatever time he could spare from the work of the *Khuddam-i-Ka'aba*

Society for which he had practically "renounced" the world of which he had been to your knowledge so jovial and companionable a member. Well, you saw me at Mehrauli soon after this and can easily recall how unwilling I was to appeal to the Govt. of India against the decision of the Head of that midget Province which comprised no more than a *thana* and a *tehsil*. I knew only too well what forces must have combined together against me to shape the decree of internment, and I had no mind to appeal to people some of whom I believed to have been privy to the order that I was advised to appeal against. Besides, I was naturally very angry and I desired nothing more than to show to friends and foes alike how a good Muslim and a good Indian could meet the undeserved dictates of malevolent fate. All that I consented to do was to address direct to Lord Hardinge a letter frankly telling him of the dangers that I foresaw of permitting, in the name of the defence of India and the public safety, the persecution of one political party by another.

Many of my friends, however, who claimed to have an inner knowledge of the working of the Government machine urged me to appeal to the Government of India while Lord Hardinge was still Viceroy. They assured me that the Viceroy did not like my internment, though when it had been carried out he was not inclined to interfere with the discretion of the local Govt. even of the so-called Province of Delhi, and referred to the Defence of India Act and the Rules framed thereunder which left no room for the Govt. of India to intervene. I consented at long last to appeal and prepared a draft Memorial which I was going to revise as I read the proofs in consultation with some lawyer friends.[4] Unfortunately for that Memorial, there was a change of Deputy Commissioner here just when the draft was being sent to Horniman to Bombay on March 2, 1916, to get printed within a week or so for submission to Lord H. through the customary channel, i.e., the local administration. This gentleman, following the unfortunate bent of mind of many members of his service, interposed his own wishes in a matter in which he had no authority, that being deliberately, and for

4 See Mohamed Ali to James DuBoulay, 24 March 1916, in Hasan (ed.), i, pp. 249-50.

obvious reasons, reserved under the D. of I. Rules for the local Govt. He asked me to see him, and in the course of the interview talked of possible publicity and the rest of it, and offered to get the Memorial printed for me at the Govt. Press, Nagpur. I could have easily told him that this was a matter in which I was perfectly free to choose my own printing press, and could have politely referred to the limits of his jurisdiction as the censor of my correspondence only. But I was anxious not to appear unduly insistent on the extent of my rights and the limits of his duties, and cheerfully accepted his offer. But in the end I discovered that the Govt. Press, the services of which he had so light-heartedly bespoken, could not print my Memorial, and I was informed that the local Govt. desired to see it *before* it was printed and came to it in the ordinary course. This information reached me more than three weeks after the time when I was sending the Memorial to the "Chronicle" Press at Bombay, so that even if I sent the half-legible unrevised draft as it was going to the compositors it could not have reached Lord H. in time to serve any useful purpose.

I think I have already told you what I thought about sending the Memorial to Lord H's successor at a time when he was not likely to have got a full grasp of affairs personally and was still likely to have handed over the appeal to the same people for decision who had virtually passed the order appealed against, if not actually. I have no interest in pre-judging the very last tribunal in India, but I would be acting foolishly if in a letter that I addressed to one whose legal advice I sought I kept back from him anything so germane to the matter as my impressions about the Govt. of India's attitude. It is certainly wrong to think that in our affairs they are now as disinclined to interfere as Lord H's and our common friends wished us to believe Lord H had been. From one or two recent decisions, it seems that the local administration wants to leave us well alone—(obviously we had never done anything to merit its displeasure, and it may well be far from satisfied that we have been dumped down here from far off Delhi)—but that it is unable to exercise its own discretion against the instructions of the Govt. of India (It is a law point worth considering whether the Govt.

of India has any powers under the Act left to itself to deal with persons interned in their sole discretion by the local Govts. under the rules framed under the Act).

Anyway, I would never think of appealing from the exercise of "executive discretion" to some higher "executive discretion", after what experience I have had of such appeals, when there is a judiciary—even such as it is—that I could refer the matter to. The Defence of India Act has of purpose aforethought slammed, barred and bolted every door that leads to a court of law. But the Moment case, which induced the Secretary of State to desire Parliament to enact validating provisions in the Government of India (Amendment) Act, and the proceedings of the Joint Committee of the two Houses that considered it before it was enacted have led me to doubt if the doors of law courts could be so easily slammed in our faces and then effectively barred and bolted. Lord Lorsburn and Sir Courteney Ilbert were both of opinion that there were numerous Acts which had not been validly enacted by Indian legislatures in recent times, but which some of the proposed amendments in the Bill before the Committee would validate. It seems that the India Office confessed this, for Lord Islington handed to this President of the Joint Committee a list of no less than 35 such Acts—and the Defence of India Act was the first on the list. I understand Mrs. Besant intends to test the validity of the orders passed against her by two local Govts. under the Act by reference to the law courts. Be that a sit may, I would myself prefer to refer the matter to the judiciary rather than submit an appeal to the executive, and that's why I need your assistance, at first for a consultation only.

You know how intensely I feel the injustice of this internment, and although my Memorial to Lord H. was there and with slight modifications have been submitted to his successor, there was this to be said against that course that the advocacy was no more impersonal than its appeal to the judge that had to lead the decision thereon could have been. Lord H. knew, as his successor cannot know, the services I had rendered to him and his Government, and how I had incurred the displeasure of the very elements in the Indian bureaucracy that had opposed their own will to his. Not that I expected the slightest partiality towards myself from that astute Viceroy, whose sole aim was the good of

his country and people, just as my sole aim was the good of my country and my people. Only Lord H. had not to depend on what I may call the "Departmental" view for an understanding of the case. Well, it was considered more advisable to make the advocacy in every way impersonal, and I asked Hasnoo *Bhayya** to accept my brief. I will tell you why I did not select you, who were no less attached to me. The fact is that throughout this internment I have kept before myself, among other things, one important consideration. I know that there is none today to question the use of its discretion by any local Government, and having good reason to believe that it was my past record of activities rather than anything I may have done since the war broke out that led to my internment, I wanted to associate no friend and fellow-workers of mine in the past with the advocacy of my cause that could be treated on that account precisely in the manner in which I had been. I, therefore, selected one who has great affection for me. and who could not have been a wholly unsympathetic spectator of my public activities, but who had yet not shared them. No one could intern the ex-Hon. Mr. Justice Hasnoo *Bhayya*, who, far from being in the same fragile bark with me in a storm-tossed sea of agitation had sat, throughout the period of my somewhat rapid "lapse from grace" high and dry in the seats of the might as one of His Majesty's Puisne Judges in the High Court of Judicature in Fort William in the Presidency of Bengal, dispensing equal justice not only between citizen and citizen but also between the citizen and the State.

Hasnoo *Bhayya* most willingly agreed to draw up my Memorial, and even rebuked me—as I must own I feared he would do—for my daring to think of marking on the brief some part of the sale proceeds of the *Jagir* which my grandfather had earned at tremendous risk of his own life by saving the lives of the then U.P. Govt. and their womenfolk when they had been practically beseiged in the summer resort of Nainital in May 1857. Rampur was then the only oasis of friendliness through a vast arid desert of hostility, or at best dubious neutrality, extending over the whole of Rohilkhand, and, in fact the whole of the Province.

**Hasan Imam.*

Well, the mention of these ancestral acres has taken me off quite at a tangent, and I suppose lawyers like you do not like irrelevancies in their briefs so that I must apologise for them (They deserve thanks nevertheless for being there to stave off bankruptcy if they can do no more than that for the grand-children). Hasnoo *Bhayya*, while rebuking me for mentioning fees, asked me to send him all the papers of the case after collecting them from all the four corners of the earth and sub-editing them into a sort of brief. But since I have come to doubt the legitimacy of the Defence of India Act I have done little regarding the Memorial. However, it was obviously too much to worry Hasnoo *Bhayya* about the quite distinct and separate matter of testing the validity of the Act in a court of law. As a judge of the High Court he steadily lost 5 or 6 thousand a month for some years, and I would not therefore like to take away more of his valuable time than I can help. But after our consultation here you will be able to consult him there for me, and jointly arrive at a satisfactory line of action.

I think you would like me to explain the situation to you to some extent even before you come, for your stay here must necessarily be short. Now the first important consideration is that not only were the internment orders passed entirely behind our backs, but other restrictions have also been subsequently imposed from time to time without the least reason being assigned, and not only has no opportunity been given to us before they were imposed to show cause why they should not be imposed, but even after they have been imposed nothing that we have said has mattered the least, and in fact we have reason to suspect that our representations are being treated as so much waste paper. This encourages every local officer who is inclined to harass us to write whatever he likes to the local administration behind our backs, and you know the practice of local Governments in such cases too well to need any further enlightenment from us as to the results of such reports to ourselves.

If we had only one or two men to deal with there may not have been so many worries as we have been experiencing. But we have had no less than 5 Deputy Commissioners within a year When we came here on November 23, 1915, Mr. Chitnavis here, a very senior officer of the old Statutory Civil

Service who had acted as a Commissioner also, was the D.C. He and I had once met at Oxford, though I had lost all recollection of it until he reminded me. This fact made things somewhat awkward for us both, as we had to guard against the suspicion which those hostile to us might have tried to create to the effect that he was on that account lenient in dealing with us. With a mere stranger I feel sure he would have felt less restraint. But of one thing we were certain while he was here. We could feel certain that he took no private malevolent pleasure in seeing us harassed, and that whatever was done to us was done in obedience to clear and definite orders from his superior officers. He was as strict as he well could be under those orders; but if some busy body wished to try a flourish or two of his own by way of variation in the standing orders, he saw to it that it went no further than it had already gone when it was made known to him.

But he did not remain in office more than 3 months, and retired before his time was up as he preferred to settle down in this healthy place as a private citizen rather than go on transfer elsewhere in the last few years of his service. He was followed by a Mr. Hemingway, who appeared to be anxious to show us every politeness and consideration, but who mistakenly took upon himself to try and regulate our lives as only the local Government was authorised to do under the D. of I. Act and the ancillary Rules. He was not content to carry out the orders issued, but constantly referred to Govt. in a manner suggesting an invitation of further restrictions. We had to be all the time when he was here on our guard lest new fetters were placed on our hands and feet all of the D.C's own forging. He was not living a very healthy life, and this, added to his very poor knowledge of Urdu, led to his placing considerable dependence on one of his subordinates in the matter of the censorship of our Urdu correspondence, which in its turn led to that individual also trying his hand at a little forging of letters on his own account. The result was much needless controversy, though I must admit, it never resulted in a settled harshness or ruggedness of relations. He was apt to be hasty as one in his state of health was only too likely to be. But, when his mistake was pointed out to him and he was convinced of the absence of authority for some of his actions he was seldom

remiss in expressing regret and altering his course of action, unless, of course in the meantime he had obtained fresh authority from the Chief Secretary. For our part we prefer to have dealings with officials of a character that a written record thereof may remain for future reference if ever a difference arose between the official version and our own (*Scripta manent*). This has proved very useful, and we mean to adhere to this course. But we never avoided settlement by personal interview of such matters as showed a possibility of misunderstanding being the true cause of disagreement. Mr. Hemingway preferred this to writing very often, and we saw each other several times in the course of his stay here between March and the middle of July—a total period of 4½ months when he fell ill and went to Nagpur on short leave, afterwards taking furlough when his condition necessitated careful treatment and complete rest.

Early in August a local officer acted for him for about a fortnight, and appeared inclined to be very domineering and even impolite, and I had to tell him that I resented such behaviour. He tried his hand at some religious interference also, but I understand that Govt. were disinclined to countenance such an intolerable intervention on the part of its officials in matters of faith. They had been led, very early after our coming here, to issue to Shaukat an order which as a Muslim he could not accept as binding on him. And although the tone of the communication from the Local Government in which its cancellation was announced called for another representation, it was satisfactory enough as an indication that no attempt on the part of local officers to interfere in matters of our belief and worship would receive the support of Government. I thought it only fair to make this much clear to you in a communication in which I am afraid I shall have to explain much that is far less satisfactory.

About the middle of August last we had our fourth D.C. whom we found to be no less strict in carrying out the orders of Govt. and referring to it for clearer instructions whenever he felt any doubt about their scope and import erring in this matter on what he considered to be the safe, and we considered to be the wrong side. But, nevertheless, he would easily admit his mistake whenever we pointed out to him that he was unduly stretching a point or acting altogether

outside the limits of the ruling order of the Govt. on the subject. If it was shown to his satisfaction that any of his subordinates were acting without authority to our prejudices he at least made satisfactory arrangements for the future if he did not openly punish them for such unauthorised and malicious action in the past. He sought long interviews whenever the necessity arose and we managed to clear everything satisfactorily. He officiated for three months, and before his departure had occasion to inform Govt. as to our attitude generally and our conformity to the lines of action prescribed for us by Govt. Without our knowledge, and of course without any suggestion from us, he assured Govt. that we had never attempted to evade the regulations nor troubled him needlessly, and that, in fact, our attitude was in every way very reasonable. At this the Chief Commissioner expressed his extreme gratification, and assured us that the standing orders would not be interpreted in a harsh manner, nor would we be unduly inconvenienced.

This assurance was naturally most welcome, and doubly so as it had come unexpectedly and was wholly unsolicited. But almost the immediate sequel of this assurance gives rise to grim reflections on what is popularly called "the irony of fate". Mr. Mathias left Chhindwara soon after this, and was replaced by a Mr. Batchelor, and from the very first day we have found him to be strangely hostile to us. In fact, if we had not received the above assurance from Govt. we would have reasonably inferred from his dealings with us that he came with definite private instructions from some one in authority over him to give us what is, I believe, called "Hell". Mr. Mathias had of his own accord expressed to him—I think he said it was to him direct—a wish that he might come here a little before he took over charge of the district so that the orders relating to us and the practice of his predecessors might be explained to him. He even suggested to us the desirability of our meeting his successor, to which we naturally had no objection. When he called on us to bid us good-bye he seemed somewhat reticent about the arrangements he had desired to make, and I would not risk a guess as to what had happened between the two. But we have learnt painfully enough since the middle of last November that the newcomer was unacquainted with the standing orders, and not only

ignorant of the practice of his predecessors but disinclined to have any consideration for it. What is more, he was distinctly inclined to make demands for which he had no authority and disinclined to confess he had been mistaken when he was clearly but politely shown that he had been wrong. Where he had even the least discretion left to him, even if it had only been left technically, of the two or more possible uses thereof he was inclined to use the one that would clearly be inconvenient to us without being on that or any other account helpful to the Govt. that had given him a *locus standi* in the matter. For instance, what we regarded and still regard as a totally uncalled for new restriction was, without any explanation of its need or any action or ours in the past necessitating it, imposed on us about this time last year, requiring us to obtain the D.C.'s permission before receiving any visitor who came to see us from beyond the limits of Chhindwara. Against this order we intended to submit a representation. But many friends who had intended to visit us had been kept off by us owing to the fact that our house had not been furnished at all before we came and was furnished after no less than some three months. Now that they were expected any day, we thought it necessary to warn all intending visitors that they must come prepared for permission to be received by us being refused by the D.C. who had been given this discretion. So we submitted a press note for permission to publish, as it was otherwise impossible to warn all the intending visitors, some of whom may have been, as in Mehrauli, total strangers who sympathised with us or had some business of their own with us. The Chief Commissioner, however, assured us that the new order was not issued to restrict our freedom to receive outside visitors, but merely to keep the D.C. informed as to who such visitors were and that consequently the publication of any such note in the Press was unnecessary. After this assurance not a single visitor was refused the permission that we applied for before Mr. Batchelor came here. But since he has taken over charge we have had the greatest difficulty about this matter also. Old Bukhari wired to me from Delhi on the 21st December last after his visit to Sir George Barnes (cousin of Hugh Barnes, formerly of the India Council and L.G. of Burma, who had befriended him as an old Frontier Officer and friend of his people when Bukhari was

in England), that he would pay me his annual visit after Lucknow. I applied for permission the very day I got his wire, but it was not given and when I asked again I was told the matter had been referred to the local Govt. No reply came from there either, and in the meantime Bukhari turned up here one night after we had all gone to bed, having left Lucknow two days earlier than he had intended, later, on account of your friend the Grand Qazi of the *Langham*, as I discovered later. Well, I had to send him back on a cold enough night back to the Railway Station either to sleep in the train, or to beg, borrow or steal a bed, and sleep thereon in the waiting room. And next day, I assure you I was harassed no less than three times before I obtained what was called "provisional permission" to entertain him as my guest. Don't imagine that it was because old B. was a man who (although he had been living in the Punjab throughout the year that had intervened between his visit to me now and his visit last year straight from the European Asylum at Lahore) had his home at Peshawar also that he had not immediately been given the permission I had applied for. Why, one morning an old and somewhat decrepit old *Pahlwan* [wrestler] whom we did not know at all turned up at our Bungalow, and we learnt from him that he was a fellow-townsman of ours who had left Rampur as a young lad some 30 or 40 years ago. He had been in the service of several Indian princes but, having fallen ill somewhere in these parts while on a journey and run short of funds, he sought out two fellow townsmen who he had heard were here. My dear *Bhayya*, it took us some time and much needless correspondence before we could keep even this poor old man in our servants' quarter while we arranged to give him his railway fare to Rampur. The latest is the application to receive Ghulam Husain, Vilayat Ali (Bambooq), and two other Barabanki Vakils, all Old Boys of Aligarh.[5] Mr. Batchelor would not give the permission himself, but referred to the local government once more,[6] although he knew the reference would take time and these fellows wanted to come at the end of January. Even the

5 Mohamed Ali to Batchelor, 23 January 1917, L 2894, MAP (7).

6 Batchelor to Mohamed Ali, n.d., MAP, and 31 January 1917, L 289 MAP (7).

letter telling Bambooq that I had applied for permission was not passed for more than a week. It is only just now that I have heard I may receive them, and the letter to Bambooq has been passed only after I had made a guess (without the least certainty about its being correct) as to what had offended the censor in that letter and had eliminated a most innocuous phrase the substance of which I can prove he had passed on an earlier occasion without demur even though it had been phrased more amply but in no other way differently.

That brings me to the subject of censorship and it is here that harassment is constant. If you do not have many visitors from outside you need not often apply to the D.C., and can thus avoid much contact with him, living your restricted and quiet life without further official interference as long as this War lasts or you are interned. But letters you must write even if you are as lazy as myself and neglect anxious enquiries from friends about you. And it is here that the censor comes in. When Hailey imposed a censorship on my publication, I gave up writing for the Press, knowing only too well that they would not permit the publication of anything that it was my duty to give to my people even though they had put in a proviso, liberal enough to all seeming, about the Chief Secretary being authorised to scrutinise and pass what I submitted to him. (In Delhi it was an E.A.C. who acted as the censor of the *Hamdard* also; but this was only for form's sake as my transfer to Lansdowne had already been arranged). Only once did I submit a statement regarding the cessation of the publication of the *Hamdard* to Burn for permission to send it to the press. I had not the remotest connection with the defence of India, and the effect it could have had on public safety could be judged from the fact that not even the tiniest streamlet in India was set on fire when one of my colleagues sent to the Press a statement on the same subject worded far more strongly than mine In fact no one desired to set any of the numerous rivers of India on fire, the object being only to let people know that it was not through cowardice that we had shut up shop, but because the censorship, whatever its original object, was permitted by Hailey to be worked in a manner which was certain to kill the paper and stop my business. Whether the Indian Press has thereby been strangled or not I would let the officials to judge for themselves. What is only too certain and undoubted is the fact that

the poor inoffensive *Hamdard* was the only journal throughout India that was even subjected to this killing process, and you are as well qualified to judge as I am whether its object was to maintain public safety or defend India or merely to ruin me financially. (The latter, whether that was or was not the real objective, has certainly been achieved only too effectively and my only source of income is the miserable pittance that I am given out of public funds as my subsistence allowance). But even this does not seem to satisfy my old friends. I have been pursued even to these backwoods and the U.P. Government has had enquiries addressed to me by the C.P. Government about the authorship of a mysterious poem which is alleged to have been contributed by me to an Urdu paper of Fyzabad, which I have never seen in my life and even of the existence of which I do not think, I was made aware before this. As I have not to this day been favoured with a copy of the verses I know not if it is my minor poetry that has caused all this flutter, though I have now been sufficiently, painfully and pointedly warned of the perils of poetry.

However, as the proviso that I could write for the Press if I submitted my composition to the Chief Secretary and obtained his approval, would lead any one to judge...it was never contemplated by government that I should be cut off entirely from the world. But like the proviso that we could leave the municipal limits of our place of internment with the previous permission of the Chief Secretary, this proviso has also proved wholly illusory. The U.P. Govt. would not permit me to run up to Rampur when my daughter was at death's door in 1915 and the Govt. of India twice refused Shaukat's application that he should be interned at Rampur for the cotton season so that he could look after his factory, with the result that last year the factory did little business while it paid the entire staff, and, in consequence lost on the working, besides incurring liability for 10,000 rupees as interest on borrowed capital, and this year, when our nephew, Khurshid, who used to assist Shaukat was too ill and had to be sent to the hills, the factory had to remain closed and the staff that had been engaged had to be sent back. Shaukat will have to pay the interest again this year by selling off his property. But in the meantime a suit has been filed by a small creditor for recovery of debt before payment falls due,

and, as his excuse for this, clearly says that he has been pressed to do so. Shaukat wanted permission to visit Rampur for four or five days to settle this matter and save his factory from being sold in execution of a decree—in case it was given by the court—for less than a fifteenth of its value. The Govt. of India refused the permission, while the local Govt. refused even to forward to the Govt. of India an application to the effect that the state may be requested to have the hearing of the case postponed till he had been released from internment or permission had been accorded to him to go to Rampur and fight the case out or settle it out of court. What trouble has been caused to us and to poor Moazzam and his junior in the matter you must have already come to know from M himself.

To revert to the censorship, I could avoid the reference of what I wrote to people who were my political adversaries, for their approval before publication, by avoiding much writing altogether. I could hereby enjoy a certain amount of self-sufficiency within the narrow limits of my internment, just as I had determined to do in the matter of applying for permission to go out by deciding to give up thinking of ever doing so before I was completely free. There remains then only one aspect of our life in which we were forced into contact with an official in spite of the firmest resolve in the world to live our lives quietly without any reference to them, and this was correspondence. Apart from my habitual distance for writing many letters I had this additional reason for restricting my private correspondence that since the end of June 1915, a censor had been appointed by Sir James Meston to scrutinise it. This restriction even Hailey had not impose. But then how could I expect to be transferred to the jurisdiction of Sir James and escape additional restrictions ? Nevertheless, I was free to write on any subject, and never was objection taken to anything I wrote by the censor in the U.P. who was the only I.C.S. official in Lansdowne (He was in semi-independent charge of the place) and had an officer of the Indian Police specially sent for the purpose of assisting him in the censorship. This was the only consistent course that could have been adopted when I was definitely told that I could write for the Press also, only submitting my writings to a more responsible censor than the joint Magistrate of Lansdowne and his Police assistant.

When we came to the C.P. the same orders continued in force for some time. But all of a sudden towards the end of February we were informed that in future our correspondence would have to be confined to purely private and domestic business affairs, and that messages of the sort of telegram that I had sent you to Bombay, with the fullest approval of the censor in December 1915, would not be passed. Apart from the absolute innocuousness of that wire, which you can judge for yourself, and the eventual absence of any untoward that could have been suspected to result from the freedom I enjoyed as regards the matter of my private letters, this new restriction was strangely inconsistent with the proviso that we could write for the press submitting our writings to another censor, *viz.*, the Chief Secretary, for approval before publication. Even I am not so egoistic that I could fill the column of news paper with my 'private and domestic business affairs'.

But that was not all. We have discovered by experience what we had every reason to fear from the very nature of things that there is no consistency in the matter of censorship, no standard having been clearly set up for discrimination between public and private affairs, and everything being left to "executive discretion". This has resulted in constant worry and friction since last November when Mr. Batchelor took over charge. Not that it was altogether absent when Mr. Hemingway was here. He was at times very erratic, and of course always preferred to err on the wrong side, particularly in matters concerned with our faith, which he was apt to regard as a public affair in the sense that one who had been interned was not supposed to be entitled to regard matters relating to his salvation as his own private affairs, a proposition that has only to be stated to be condemned. But if we had occasion to remonstrate with him once a month or once in two or three weeks and to have the matter referred to the Local Administration, we have had occasion to do so twice or thrice a week and this when I for one have practically given up writing except once in a fortnight or so to my wife or to some more than usually pressing correspondent among my friends. You know how many friends we have in every part of India and among all communities. Yet if you were to judge from our correspondence now you would be inclined to say that Shaukat had but a dozen, and to adjudge me to be the most friendless man in Asia.

If, after being treated, during the last 2½ months as we have been in this matter, we are led to suspect that the object of all this harassment is to compel us to stop all correspondence, it is not due to our suspecting natures. (And you know how "suspecting" we are !). Letters submitted by us are delayed most unduly and unprecedently. The censor tells us, when we complain on this score (and the Local Govt. only repeats it), that it is only because we do not follow more closely the order of the Govt. of India that our correspondence should be confined to private and domestic affairs. Now, I have enough material in my possession to prove to the hilt that this excuse is baseless inasmuch as most of the letters that are delayed are those to which the censor has taken no objection at all, his rejections being only too prompt and suggesting nothing of careful consideration demanding time and delay. We have at least a dozen times requested him to let us know if a letter is withheld or referred for orders as a doubtful one to the L.A. as his predecessors *invariably* used to do unasked. He has not even had the politeness to reply even once to these requests, though he fitfully tells us—mostly when we write to him more than once—that has happened to such of our letters as have not been returned to us. When a letter never returns at all and nothing is heard about it even from the Local Government, we are led to conclude that it is lost, and the only satisfaction that we get in such cases is that Mr. B tells us he has no recollection that it had been withheld. This reference to his recollection is of little use considering that his letters to us show only too unmistakably that he reads our letters without much care and attention, and even forgets the next day what he had himself written only the day before.

When the previous censors found in any of our letters something that they thought they could not pass, they used to mark on the margin or underneath, with a pencil, the word, phrase or passage to which they objected. The new censor began by scoring out whole pages of matter that could by no stretch of imagination be called other than private. He refused to say what was objectionable therein, and not, wishing to quarrel on the very first occasion, I submitted an expurgated edition, so to speak, of the letters returned with whole pages scored out. A comparison of what was left to stand with what had been scored out so ruthlessly would convince any man that there was nothing to choose between the two, and I suppose

some such conclusion must have been obvious to the censor also when the "rumps" were sent back to him. *Since then he has ignored repeated requests to mark the words or passages to which he objects—a device as old as the hills to escape the reversal of decisions by a higher authority and even the preparation of a reasoned appeal.* He does not say he won't, much less say *why* he won't, but merely repeats each time the words that he cannot pass the letter, which obviously none wants him to do when he says once that he won't. Tired of constant writing and requesting we began to...*and to take out a word or a sentence, with the result that letters that had been delayed for days and even weeks because he would not himself indicate to what he had taken objection, much less why, were passed readily enough when re-submitted in this form. And yet the local government, when appealed to, upholds the censor and abuses *us* as obstructionists into the bargain. I have yet to know what it may have to say about a post-card in which only the words "To one who has said good-bye to all mundane politics" had to be taken out before I could be permitted to convey to Bambooque and friends the simple information that permission to receive them as visitors had been applied for, and that several *mahfil-i-Milad-i-Shareef* had taken place here in which, at the urgent request of the people here, I had said something about the life and times and teachings of our great Prophet—a labour of love to one who had said good-bye to all mundane politics—so that I could not get time to write to him the long promised sweet and long letter. The latest is a letter written by Shaukat to a nice little fellow whom you may have met at Aligarh. This was delayed for 20 days, then returned with the remark that it would not be passed, then re-submitted by Shaukat *unaltered* with the remark that he found nothing therein that was not private, and then—immediately *passed just as it had originally been sent.* And yet the censor (who would not mark anything to which he had objected) claims one day to have made "some erasures" in a letter that he had absolutely and finally refused to pass and a few days after says he had sent to the Govt. "*the* deleted passage." Whereas he had refused to mark in this case also the passage to which

*Illegible.

he objected, though *twice requested*, and had of course made no erasure or deletion whatever. This was a business letter to Moazzam, and one would have thought that no delay would be permitted in sanctioning its transmission particularly when the G of I while refusing Shaukat permission to go to Rampur for his case had said that all facilities would be given to him to obtain legal assistance and advice, and when in direct defiance of this the censor had already withheld a letter from Moazzam about the case (to which Shaukat's letter was a reply) which the local administration had however returned to S. though *after* the date of hearing for which it sought instructions and offered advice. When S. after making up his mind to refer the matter to Govt. delayed it for a fortnight quite characteristically, and sent it at last when matters were growing worse every day. Mr. B. delayed the transmission of the complaint also for several days on the ground that he wanted to see the original in which he claimed to have made the erasures that existed nowhere beyond his own imagination. Shaukat was naturally wrath at this and appealed to Govt. to adjudicate upon it after consulting a handwriting expert if necessary. When at last the letter did reach the Chief Secretary the only apparent result was that the censor's action was upheld, without any enquiry into the non-existent erasures that he so resolutely claimed to have made and without indication of what was objectionable in that letter. On the contrary Shaukat was told in language that was far from polite that it was he who had been obstructing.

A far more serious matter than this is one that relates to a letter which Shaukat received from Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. What it all is you will see for yourself from the enclosed copy of the protest Shaukat sent to the Chief Commissioner. As for the sequel, I shall not risk the expression of an opinion as I feel too strongly to trust myself in setting it down. Justice is refused; the subordinate that has not only acted most illegally but has also betrayed the confidence reposed in him when he was authorised to look into correspondence of private individuals who were the merest strangers to him—a thing which only the clearest necessity of the State could deprive of its unsavoury nature—is let off without the merest apology for punishment, and the whole thing is declared to be a book into which government

shall look no more, all because the man who protested valued his own and his greatly respected friend's character more than the official measure for such values which the local government's reply indicates, and had not made Uriah Heep's motto: "Be Humble" also his own even though he was only a *detenu.*

However, there is this consolation that such adroitness does not close the door on those whom Mr. B. has been openly maligning, though you know Shaukat's long-suffering nature and his remarkable patience. You also know his opinion about justice in law courts and I cannot say what he may eventually decide to do. At present he is keeping his own counsel, which shows how much he has been pained by the attitude of the Chief Commissioner—has pained even him who used to lecture to me on the philosophy of "Grin-and-Bear" most stoically—I should rather say like an epicurean, for he believes in being merry even unto the last—and who had suggested to Moazzam,[7] whom the decision of government about permission to Shaukat to go to Rampur for his case had naturally made very indignant, to drink a glass of cold water and count 25.

I have written at a length that would be preposterous were it not that I wanted you to get a clear idea of the situation before you came. Apart from the last item, which you will agree cannot be tolerated with any pretensions to self-respect, the matters referred to would certainly appear to an outsider as rather trivial. So they are and would be to us also if we could avoid all dealings with a man of this type as other people can do. But even if there was no likelihood of future trouble of a more serious nature, when they are—as you must know from the demoralisation of a class of our people—jackals enough who would do any dirty thing if it gave any hope of personal preferment, and when the District Officer is openly hostile even then there is the utter impossibility of avoiding all dealings with the latter without giving up all communication with friends and relations, and there is also the cumulative effect of pin-pricks that go on from day to day. Of one thing you may be certain that we shall not bend ourselves before the bureaucracy, and the neck that has been bowed before the one and only God will not be bent

7 For biographical note, Hasan (ed.), *i*, p. 312.

before others. It may be that this is already too well understood by these men ; and that they desire merely to provoke us into some breach of internment regulation. About this I can only say that so far Shaukat has not only resisted any temptation that he may have at times felt—though I have not yet noticed that he even felt such temptation but has also exercised the most soothing influence on me. And though at times I feel tempted to denounce the whole of this calculated tyranny to the world, I find besides Shaukat's precepts and his example, the precepts of the Holy Book of God and the example of His Prophet (whose fortitude withstood and outlives all the persecutions to which the infidels subjected him for 13 long years in Mecca, the home that he had to leave, and for 6 or 7 years more in his exile also at Medina),[8] the greatest sources of consolation and comfort. So you need not fear much on that score. This I am all the more inclined to say because you have at your elbow that prince of pessimists —but quick to be roused to anger like a panther—my dear little wife's dear little elder brother to think, whenever there is the least thing astir, that I am fast treading the primrose path to the gallows. After 32 pages of stuff that would do credit to those purveyors of mild sensations—the editors of *The Daily Mail*—it seemed to me necessary to reassure you on that score. But I shall all the same value it greatly if you will find some time *soon* from your many and lucrative cases and come to advise us.

8 Accompanied by his followers, the Prophet Mohammad arrived in Yathrib on 24 September 622. Yathrib was hence called Medina (al-Madinah, the city of the Prophet), and the migration was termed *hijra* chosen as the starting point of the new lunar calendar.

7. From Haroon Khan Sherwani[1]

Mosharraf Manzil
Aligarh, U.P.
5 February 1917

It is a very long time indeed since I have written to Shaukat or yourself, and I do not remember ever having received a letter from you ever since your internment at Chhindwara. I heard the other day that the government had consented that you should get an increased allowance; if this is so, please accept my warm congratulations.

Things seem to be moving very fast indeed in the theatre of operations, and the latest of German threats is nothing short of gauntlet thrown in the face of the whole world. However, this fact is not without a rather remarkable parallel in India itself, for while the political arena has been remarkable this year for the Hindu-Muslim *entente*, the Aligarh-Punjab faction has thrown the gauntlet in the face of all progress and political reform;[2] and although our friends of the Punjab have not thought twice before having the resolution about that awful *hawwa* [spectre], the Home Rule,[3] however, it is patent on the face of it that sincerity or respect for principles is not one of their public qualities. Their greatest leader, Shafi himself, although he was one of that remarkable specimens of humanity which were against Gokhale's Education Bill, has this fear declared that he would gladly see compulsory free elementary education all over the country ! So you see we are letting on !

1 He was the son of Haji Musa Khan and a distinguished member of the Datauli branch of the Sherwani Pathan family. He was educated in Aligarh and Oxford and rose to become one of the leading historians of medieval India. As professor of History and Political Science at Osmania University, Hyderabad, he wrote several important works on Medieval Deccan.

2 The reference is to the politically conservative alliance between the group of Nawab Muzzamilullah Khan in Aligarh and that of Mian Mohammad Shafi in the Punjab.

3 Haroon Khan Sherwani was one of the leading organisers of the Home Rule League in Aligarh. See *Leader*, 15 July 1917.

8. To Mazharul Haq*

Chhindwara
9 March 1917

I hope you had a comfortable journey and are now safely back at your legislative work in Delhi and in the thick of the budget discussions.[1]

We too are having a interesting time of it, to put it "euphemistically". We were told when we first came here that the town of Chhindwara had a total population of some 13,000 not to mention the many tens of thousands of the rest of the district. But, if you credit bazar news, the entire population of the place consists of the two of us or of one or two of our relations also. It seems that the Inspector-General of Police who was here a little while ago was chiefly concerned with those who occasionally visited us or whom we occasionally visited, and if any citizen of Chhindwara was not in the town during his very short stay here, is it not as clear as noonday sun that he was an absconder. The latest is that some of our glory has now got reflected on to you. For Mirza Siddiq Ali Beg Saheb, whom you know, was sent for the very day you left us and when he saw the D.C. he was remonstrated with for having visited you at our place. Wonders, it seems, would never cease for I should have thought that the safest people to meet each other in these tricky days would have been an Honorary Magistrate proud of ancestral loyalty to government and a colleague of His Excellency the Viceroy—so at least did Lord Hardinge invariably refer to the members of his Legislative Council. As a matter of fact his visits are considered as all the more heinous an offence because of his being an Honorary Magistrate, and I am given to understand that there was a veiled threat in the D.C's discourse regarding the loss of that honour, which has made Mirza Saheb, whom

*This letter was withheld. Batchelor to Mohamed Ali, 11 March 1917, L 2819, MAP (7).

1 The censor objected to certain parts of the letter; so Mohamed Ali wanted to 'alter or remove them if I am convinced that their transmission is not permitted by the government...Mr. Mazharul Haq, besides being an intimate friend of ours, is also our legal adviser. Naturally I wish to keep him informed as to all that happens to us here...' Mohamed Ali to E. Batchelor, 12 March 1917, L 3075, MAP (7).

the D.C's treatment and tone has obviously touched to the quick, contemplate resignation from all public offices that he has been holding unless he is assured that he would not be subjected to such treatment in the future. I cannot say anything more definitely about this matter as we are anxious to do nothing that could even remotely suggest that it was we who guided him in a matter of this sort which obviously concerns only himself. So far as we are concerned we have already given you our word for it that we shall take no steps without giving you an opportunity to advise us, and as an earnest of this I may mention that so far Shaukat has taken no action with respect to the letters he received last month from the Local Administration regarding his complaints of the D.C's unauthorised and improper actions....*

This is not all. Just as Mirza Siddiq Ali Beg Saheb was asked about the *mehfil-i-milad-i-nabawi*** (I really cannot help being shocked at the extreme ignorance of some of these men who pride themselves on the efficiency about such well-known religious ceremonies of the people as the *milad-i-sharif*, for it seems they think I had "invented" some new devilish device of my own to assist the Germans) the Sub-Inspector was also questioned about one *mehfil* [assembly ; congregation] and deliberately ordered never to attend such a ceremony and remonstrated with for having attended one out of the 15 or so held here in the sacred month of *Rabi-ul-Awwal.****

You are by this time aware how the Local Govt. assured us last November and expressed its extreme gratification at the report of the then D.C. about our attitude but now from the very first day the present D.C. began to worry us and made no secret of his hostility to us. But even then I must say we are shocked at discovering recently that people are asked to steal papers from our place. You know the literary Bohemianism of the famous editor of the *Comrade* and the extreme untidiness of your adoptive son Shaukat. (The two things mean the same thing, though the famous editor of the

*The following paragraph is deleted; it deals with Mohamed Ali's nephews studies and their visit to Chhindwara.

**Congregation to celebrate the birth of the Prophet of Islam.

***"The first spring month", the third month of the Muslim calendar year.

Comrade cannot obviously permit the yoking together of your adoptive son with himself even in untidiness). Well, our papers are kept in the same "elegant" manner as they used to be at Calcutta and Delhi, and our house here is, if possible, even more of a *Khana-i-be takalluf** than it used to be there, so that it would be the easiest thing for the most amateur of thiefs to steal anything he wanted, though he would have to rummage through a lot of musty scraps of paper, as we could not keep the most secret papers of the most aweful conspiracy neatly tied up and arranged and safely hidden in secret drawers even to save our lives. It is not the theft that we fear, but those who can thieve papers can also quietly deposit among our papers enough documentary evidence of the elegantest little conspiracy in the world for anything from a Guy Fawkes plot[2] to blow up all the crown heads of the world down to a two anna subscription society of school boys for the overthrow of the British Empire. However, our fear is futile, for we cannot give *darwaza-band* [to close doors] even to those who bear on their brows the mark of the devil, let alone suspecting all and sundry of being the secret and extremely subtle agents of that ridiculously over-rated department over which my friend Sir Charles Cleveland[3] presided.

Well, I have kept my promise of keeping you in touch with the daily increasing worries of this place since Mr. Batchelor came here. You know all the facts and can judge for yourself who is responsible for these things. For our part we are putting up with them as we promised you, though I have already told you that "grin-and bear" does not contain all the world's wisdom in itself as Shaukat imagines or at least wishes me to believe. Goodbye.

*A house where formalities are not observed : a free house.

2 Guy Fawkes (1570-1606) was involved in a Gunpowder Plot (1604-05) to blow up the House of Parliament in revenge for penal laws against Catholics. The plot was discov.red and Fawkes was executed on 31 January 1606. November 5th, the day of Fawkes' arrest, is celebrated in England as Guy Fawkes Day.

3 Charles Rait Cleveland joined the Indian Civil Service as Assistant Commissioner in 1887. He was Inspector-General of Police before his appointment as Director of the Central Intelligence Department in 1910.

9. To E. Batchelor

Chhindwara
12 March 1917

I have duly received your letter of the 10th instant stating that you were informed that certain poems sent by me for publication (apparently in the M.A.O. College Magazine) had been withheld by the Lieutenant-Governor of the United Provinces.[1]

It is not clear from your letter whether you were directed to communicate this information to me, and, if so, by whom, and with what object.

You do not call upon me to explain anything, nor, I admit, it is any part of your duties to do so, and it would serve no purpose to trouble you with one even if I could offer any explanation in the absence of some obviously essential information about the poems in question. But since it is an offence (under the orders issued to me in conformity with the Defence of India Rules) for me to send any composition of mine for publication without first having obtained the permission of the Chief Secretary to the Local Administration in these Provinces, and since I have never obtained permission from that official for publication of any composition of mine to this day, and if it be true that I had, as you say, sent certain poems to the Aligarh College Magazine, I would be liable to imprisonment of either description which may extend to three years and also to a fine. I cannot leave the matter where it stands at present, though there are several elements of considerable amusement, not to say mirth, in the remarkable interest that has now for some time been persistently displayed by the U.P. authorities in what they believe to be my metrical compositions.

On the last occasion it was alleged by them that I had contributed a poem to a newspaper which I had never seen in all my life and even of the existence of which I believe I was for the first time made aware by the U.P. authorities themselves. In the midst of the distractions and preoccupations of a war of unparalleled dimensions and ferocity they have once more found time and inclination to busy themselves with what

1 Batchelor to Mohamed Ali, 10 March 1917, L 2819, MAP (7).

they regard as my verses, and this time they seem to credit an equally baseless story of my having sent certain poems "apparently"—though why they could not say so definitely I am at a loss to understand—in a college magazine with perhaps a yet smaller circulation than the obscure weekly newspaper of Fyzabad that had figured on the last occasion. And once again it did not occur to these authorities to send me a copy of the poems that they are fathering upon me.

I do not know whether it would be of any interest to you or to the U.P. authorities if I tell you, as I do now, that I have not sent any poems, mine or anybody else's for publication to any paper or periodical throughout the period of my internment, and whosoever believes that I have done so has obviously been once more deceived.

After the first enquiry and my definite and full reply I had hoped that this amusing episode was over. But a second enquiry was addressed to me and I replied equally definitely and still more fully in the hope that such a statement would put a quietus to such disturbing and vexatious references. I acknowledge that this time no enquiry has been addressed to me, but, whatever else may be indefinite and uncertain, one thing is believed to be beyond doubt and above the necessity of all further enquiry from the person most intimately concerned, namely, that I had sent certain poems of mine for publication. That, however, only makes what was at first an amusing episode, and subsequently developed into a disturbing and vexatious affair, a matter of somewhat grave concern. It seems that somebody who has evidently taken to heart my compliance with every harsh order issued to me during my internment and my patience in the face of most provocative treatment at the hands of certain local officials without any authority for such conduct, is anxious to discover or invent a breach of the internment regulations by me in order to see me tyrannized over still further in the name of the defence of India and the public safety. If that is so, all I can say is that, that person is doomed to still further disappointment so far as actions and omissions of mine are concerned. That much is in my power and I am resolved not to play into the hands of my enemies, open or disguised. For the rest, since it is beyond my control, I must leave it to a power higher than mine and my enemies.

Having so categorically denied that I had sent any poems of mine for publication, I should like to ask what there was in the poems withheld by the Lieutenant-Governor of the United Provinces that necessitated such unusual interference with the liberties of the Press, attenuated as they already were. If indeed the poems are mine and have without my knowledge and consent found their way to the editor of the Aligarh Monthly or some other publication, I can say with every confidence that they certainly did not merit the prominence given to them by His Honour. I cannot say whether His Honour's knowledge of Urdu, or his intimate advisors', for that matter, enables him or them to construe Urdu verses correctly and in particular the unconnected lyrical composition known as *ghazal*[2] which I use when on rare occasions I make an excursus into Urdu verse. But if he or they can construe them correctly, and the verses in question are really mine, then I fear he has ascribed to them a distinction that I could not with any pretensions to modesty have hoped for them. I have never laid a claim to any degree of eminence as a poet, and very few even of those who intimately know me suspect that I dabble in verse or am even able to compose it. As I have more than once explained to you, my verses are intended merely as a source of comfort and consolation to myself and their publication can be of little interest to others. But then it could do no harm either ; for they are wholly undistinguished from the only too numerous poems that daily find their way into the pages of Urdu reviews and magazines and into the columns of Urdu newspapers. To imagine that they could prejudice the defence of India or the public safety is to exaggerate my power and the potency of my poetry at the expense of my regard for the maintenance of my own and the public safety.

So far as I am concerned I have said all that was necessary to say. But before concluding this letter I would request you to ask the U.P. authorities to let me know what led them to come to so decided and yet entirely wrong opinion that I had sent these poems for publication. This is a matter in which I am only too obviously deeply concerned.

2 A short lyric poem consisting of couplets independent of one another in meaning, but bound by a strict unity of form, that is a uniform metre and rhyming scheme.

What His Honour did after forming this incorrect opinion is a matter that does not concern me in the same manner. But as a close student of the methods of bureaucratic administration. I shall be grateful if I am informed under what law of the realm His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has acted in 'withholding' the poems. Possibly the Defence of India Act was once more invoked. If so, permit me to say that His Honour must no doubt be aware that the increasing dissatisfaction is being felt and frankly expressed in the country with respect to the manner in which that Act is being administered by the various Local Governments and Administrations, and grave doubts are being entertained with respect to the credibility of the evidence on which Local Governments have been basing their orders under the Defence of India Rules. I fear it will not tend to allay this dissatisfaction nor remove these doubts if it becomes generally known that the Local Govt. of the U.P. permitted itself to be deceived in the matter of these poems even after having been made aware of a similar mistake on a previous occasion so very recently. I can afford to treat the matter lightly, but not so the Local Govt. of the largest Indian Province.

10. From H.M. Hayat[1]

M.A.O. College
Aligarh
28-3-1917

Without waiting for a reply to my last letter, I write this to you to let you know how matters are drifting in connection

1 Hasan Mohammad Hayat was educated at the Aligarh College, 1907-1912. He was a member of the Medical Mission led by Ansari and resigned his teaching post at Aligarh during the Non-cooperation movement. He went to England as secretary to Mohamed Ali in the Khilafat deputation of 1920; on his return, he served as member of the Congress Civil Disobedience Enquiry Committee.

with the Muslim University. Enclosed herewith is a copy of a letter that was sent by Ansoo to Bijnori.[2] A typed copy of it was sent to Khwaja and I expect one must have been sent to you also. Fearing however it might not have been sent, I furnish you with one to give you an idea of the temper of our great leaders. It is really a mystery why the Raja is so keen about the University. How did he develop into a great educationist? I never thought he had in him the making of a versatile genius. So he is proving himself to be. He has brought round to his view men like Jinnah and Mazhar and Ansari. He does possess a great magnetic force. I should not have been surprised if you had also been converted to his views, were you free to go about and enjoy his sumptuous hospitality and taken from him the secret information of what is going on in high, higher and highest quarters. The Muslims are thankful to the Raja for what he has so far done for them in face of much personal risk and the displeasure of some big folk, but he did put up a bold front, unmindful of consequences. Now he must be ever so much more bolder, as his Bhai Sahib[3] is coming to him to wash off his character roll.[4] Does he think that he can displease the Govt. with impunity, or ride roughshod over the tender feelings of his community without losing his popularity, no matter if even Jinnah and others be at his back? Or does he think that so long as his merciless and uncompromising critics are under restraint and not free to oppose or criticise him, his must be the final word with the 7 crore Muslims. We poor mortals cannot understand their ways and means. So Mazhar and Jinnah and Ansari are converted, and with them many others must be. Khwaja and Tassaduq are going to Delhi tomorrow to talk over the matter with Ansoo. Tassaduq

2 See enclosure 1.

3 The reference is to Harcourt Butler who had earlier warned the Raja of Mahmudabad of the consequences of not accepting the Muslim University on government terms. See Butler to Mahmudabad, 22 July 1912, Hasan (ed.), i, p. 108. For Mohamed Ali's bitter criticism of the Raja's role, see his letter of 6 April 1917 in *ibid.*, p. 145.

4 This is followed by a famous verse of Ghalib which speaks of the treachery of Yusuf's (Joseph) brothers and warns everyone to beware of such people who are capable of doing such things. The obvious reference is to all those who had 'betrayed' the Muslim University movement by accepting the terms on which it was offered by the government.

is now decidedly in favour of the University being accepted. His argument is that we must once accept it and then we can improve upon it. When there is a tangible thing before us we can feel a great responsibility and find out means to fit it up to suit our requirements. He had this opinion even on the 10th April, 1916 but had not the courage to express it. He says, and so say some others, that in his heart of hearts Bijnori also holds this opinion, but he too lacks the moral courage to speak out frankly and boldly. He is afraid of being hooted down. What a revelation, indeed ! Now what can be expected under the present circumstances ? Poor Khwaja is firm. He feels that you may be interned with many of your other staunch and true friends, but for him and for many of us you are not interned, so far as such matters are concerned as you are graciously permitted to have your say in. He will take the inspiration from you and attach to it as much weight and importance as if you were free and amongst us. He feels disgusted at these big threats of the Raja and ready to accept the challenge if it is being so insultingly thrown at the community. There is no doubt there is many a split in the so-called Ahrar party. Dr. Mahmud must go with Mazhar and Nazir with the Raja, and the remaining few with one or the other. So I expect to send you a wire on the 8th congratulating on the realisation of the 40 years' cherished dream of Sir Syed. Hurra !

Nothing more at present. More in my next when I have heard from you.

P.S. We might tolerate the Raja for what he has done for the Muslims and also Mazhar for the matter of that. But Jinnah has no justification for this impervious attitude. What has he done for Aligarh and what for the Muslims in general, except inviting the League to Bombay, and presiding at Lucknow. Does this give him any right to be so dictatorial. I wish he were made to understand this fully and realize where he stands. I am really wild over his threats and I wish to come face to face with him in any public meeting.

11. Enclosure 1 : Ansari to A.R. Bijnori*

Delhi
27 March 1917

I am in receipt of your letter and copy of your resignation. I am sure you meant the letter to be read by Shuaib and Sindhi. We have all read it and discussed it, and you may consider this letter to be the expression of our conjoint opinions.

I am afraid that your resignation is *ultra vires*, and does not affect your position towards the Muslim University question in any way.[1] The Regulation Committee has not yet come into existence as the government has not accepted the resolution passed at Lucknow.

Now about your attitude towards the pending question I feel that you have every right to express at the meeting of the Foundation Committee what you honestly believe to be right. I would even say that it would be unjust to yourself and unfair to the Muslim public if you did not express what you sincerely believe; and without trying to flatter you, it is due to you to express our opinion that your decision on this question would be very weighty and would be considered as such by the people present in the meeting. But before you definitely decide your attitude I wish to lay before you all the facts that have to be considered before doing so.

The Education Member,[2] as you have learnt from Sindhi's letter, advises acceptance, of course not officially, to try to accede to all our demands during the Committee stage of the bill. How far he will succeed he does not know. But there

*Mushirul Hasan (ed.), *Muslims and the Congress : Select Correspondence of Dr. M.A. Ansari 1912-1935* (Delhi, 1979), pp. 5-8.

1 The idea of developing the College into a University was mooted time and again from several platforms. For details, see M. Rahman, *From Consultation to Confrontation : A Study of the Muslim League in British Indian Politics* 1906-1912 (London, 1970), pp. 175-6.

2 Harcourt Butler, the Education Member, was a supporter of the Muslim University scheme. He believed that the government should encourage denominational Universities, which would provide religious instruction and 'inevitably tend to keep 'alive the Hindu-Muslim feelings'.

can be no doubt as regards his *bona fides*. The future Education Member may not be so sympathetic or so strong to carry out the necessary alterations in the bill. When asked whether any alterations regarding the powers of the Court, Council, Senate and Syndicate could be discussed he said that discussions not only on those matters, but about anything, not excluding the powers of the government could be brought in the Committee stage. Now this seems as much as we have any right to expect from any Education Member.

The second question is that of the Party of "Ahrar". The Raja Saheb of Mahmudabad and Jinnah demand one-sided agreement of the entire party *viz.*, acceptance of the University without opposition as the only solution to prevent disruption and disaster. My own attitude is that acceptance of the University with an opposition and division on the question would give the real feeling of the Muslims and would strengthen the hands of those members of the Council who would press for amendments in the bill during the Committee stage. And there is just a remote chance even after the Committee stage of rejecting it, should the bill be found unsatisfactory. The opposition should not carry any bitterness nor antagonism beyond the meeting of the Foundation Committee. When once the resolution is passed we should all strive to the best of our ability to make the best of a bad bargain.

But as all are aware of the uncertainty of the public mind on such occasions and there is a chance of University being rejected, specially when backed by such popular exponents as yourself and Khwaja, I despair to think what would happen when such a contingency occurs.

One naturally is led to think whether there was any possible means of ensuring the acceptance of the University with an opposition without rejection. To my mind this can only be done if all the leaders were to come to compromise on this matter, although I must admit that the position of the opposition becomes a bit false after such a compromise. But these things have happened before and do happen daily in practical politics without straining the conscience of the parties concerned.

There is another view also specially as the question is so vital and so far-reaching that the acceptance of the University

would only be fruitful when it is effected by the entire concurrence and approval of the whole community, and the opposing parties.

Then, there is the Chhindwara resolution which has already been sent to the Secretary of the Foundation Committee to the effect that this matter be postponed until after the war is over. Although it would be said by many that this is simply a matter of tactics, and not the real intention of those supporting the resolution, I maintain that this point of view is well worth consideration, and I am not sure that this may not be the only possible solution of all the opposing points of view.

Lastly, Prince Hamidullah Khan,[3] during my last visit to Bhopal was contemplating the location of the Sultania College at Aligarh with a view to affiliate it to the Muslim University.[4] This presupposes the acceptance of the University and also the fact that the future Sultania College would be able to obtain better treatment at the hands of the Muslim University than those of Allahabad. I am anxious to know if any decision has been made on this matter.

3 1894-1960; third son of the Begum of Bhopal and heir to the throne; supported the Sultania College scheme ; succeeded in 1926. Also, see Hasan (ed.), i. Appendix, p. 319.

4 *Ibid.*, Appendix, p. 317.

12. To E. Batchelor

Chhindwara
7 June 1917

After the experience of the preceding five or six months I had decided about a couple of months ago to have as little as possible to do with correspondence with officials, and even to forego the pleasure of corresponding with my numerous friends since it entailed almost invariably a good deal of correspondence with you, and of a nature not altogether pleasant, the meaning and application of regarding [*sic*] that

extremely elastic and elusive formula : "correspondence to be confined to purely private and domestic business affairs", which no two censors seemed to have understood in the same sense, and which you yourself do not seem to understand at all times in the same sense, and certainly not always as your local administration understands it. You had consistently ignored our repeated requests to indicate the passages to which you took objection, and have now the satisfaction of knowing that your local administration supports your view in this as in so many other things. Under the circumstances my unaided judgement proved wholly inadequate in making me understand your standard of permissible correspondence as distinguished from that of your predecessors, and letter-writing became sheer guess-work and a gamble. It was certainly worthwhile, except in the last resort, to write long letters to my numerous friends as I had till then been doing since they were as likely as not to be returned to me with the remark that you were unable to pass them, unless you happened, with or without intimating it to me, to retain them yourself--a proceeding which I still consider to be without any authority in the internment orders issued to us regarding our correspondence, notwithstanding what you wrote to me to the contrary on April 6 last. Complaints and, in some cases, inquiries addressed to you proved to be sterile of all results and appeals referred to the local administration provoked, in addition to a validation of your abuse of authority, only insult and threats of further curtailment of liberty, not in the interest of the defence of India or the public safety which alone legalised such actions, but merely as a mark of the Chief Commissioner's disapproval. Hence the decision to which I have alluded above to forego to a large extent the right of corresponding with my numerous friends

I could not however, help answering at long intervals the letters of such friends as persisted in writing to so unresponsive a correspondent as the character of censorship had made me. From writing some three or four letters a day I had been forced to come down to writing as many letters a month. But even that was apparently not enough. A letter written on the 29th May to a friend and brother disciple in answer to four or five of his was returned to me with the same old remark that you were unable to pass it, although I cannot pretend to

understand how the usual formula about correspondence being confined to private affairs could with any propriety be applied to such a letter. Now you have returned two other letters also written on the 4th instant in response to a very pressing request from a personal friend that, as a Governor of the Aligarh College and as a member of the Muslim University Foundation Committee on whose motion it was resolved to offer a number of scholarships to young Muslims for further study in Europe, I should assist him in securing one of these for philosophic research.

Knowing the utter futility—and, in fact, worse—of complaining of your action, I kept quiet over your refusal to pass the letter of the 29th May, and would have done the same with regard to these two letters. But since you want me to tell you why I think I am still permitted to correspond on the educational affairs relating to the M.A.O. College, Aligarh, and its *Old Boys' Association, the M.A.O. Educational* Conference and the Muslim University and the Association and various Committees connected with it, I write this and only hope that you have asked me to explain this to you out of a genuine desire for enlightenment on a point on which you do not yet possess sufficient information to guide you in the proper discharge of your duties as censor.

Well, the facts are these. Mr. Hemingway replaced Mr. Chitnavis on the 1st March 1916, and practically brought with him the new restriction contained in the standing order on which you purport to rely so often. Apparently the order was not sufficiently clear to Mr. Hemingway, and, of course, preferring to err on what we must regard as the wrong side, he continued for a long time after his taking over charge of the censorship of our correspondence to refer some letters of ours to the L.A. for orders. Amongst these were letters connected with the *Khuddam-i-Ka'aba*, a purely religious society and the Aligarh College of which we are Trustees as well as Old Boys. The local administration passed the Aligarh letters but objected to those relating to the *Khuddam-i-Ka'aba*, and on 14 March 1916, Mr. Durga Pershad Pande, E.A.C. (incharge) acting as censor in the D.C.'s absence from headquarters, wrote to us that under orders from the D.C. all our future correspondence relating to the *Khuddam-i-Ka'aba* Society would be held up here. A week later Mr. Hemingway

himself wrote to *my brother a long letter from Camp in the course of which he said:*

"For the present however I had better inform you that the *Khuddam-i-Ka'aba* is considered as a political body and no correspondence therewith or concerning it can be passed and the same applies to the Muslim League and other political bodies. On the other hand the Old Boys Association, Aligarh, is all right."

Here the Old Boys' Association, Aligarh, is expressly excluded from literal interpretation of the standing order issued less than a month previously; but the exclusion, like the *inclusion* of the *Khuddam-i-Ka'aba,* was clearly meant to be *typical* and not merely *individual,* and resting on the basis of the distinction drawn in the letter between political and non-political bodies.

But I need not labour this point, though I fear the practice of your predecessors to which I would invite your attention has no attraction for you. No one before you had demurred in the least to the freest correspondence on educational and administrative matters relating to the institutions I have named above. But if that has no binding force, surely your own practice cannot be devoid of all relevance in this connection. For nearly a year and a half that the standing order in question has been in force we have never been disturbed in our work as Trustees and Governors of the Aligarh College and members of the various committees and associations connected with the Aligarh College, the proposed Muslim University and the Mohamedan Educational Conference. Only once a contrary course was adopted, namely on the 14th March, when you "withheld" two letters of mine, one addressed to Mr. A.M. Khwaja forwarding another letter addressed to the Secretary of the Muslim University Foundation Committee together with a Resolution to be moved at the meeting of the Committee on 8th April, and the other addressed to Mr. Abdur Rahman Siddiqi relating to a scheme for the foundation of new Muslim College and the raising of a memorial to Nawab Viqarul Mulk. Against this course I protested and in para 2 of my letter dated 16th April explained how such correspondence had never been objected to before by you or by any of your predecessors. Whether in consequence of that protest or in obedience to instructions issued on reference by

the L.A. reversing your judgement—I am not able to say which—you nevertheless passed both of those letters on the 19th March, and I contented and consoled myself with the conviction that such letters at least will be allowed to proceed on their way without any further correspondence.

But prise s do not cease, and here I am explaining at still greater length what I thought was already sufficiently clear to you. Well, if this induces you to follow the practice of your predecessors for which was apparently ample authority in the instructions received from the L.A., or at least your own in this matter, all this time and trouble would not have been wasted...

Kindly let me know whether the two letters returned by you relating to the Philosophy Followship may now be considered as duly passed by you. It would certainly be odd that whereas only 3 weeks ago Mr. Zafar-ul-Hasan's letter addressed to me on this subject was of a sufficiently private business nature, it has now ceased to be so when I am forwarding it to Dr. Ansari to do what my friend had asked me to do in the way of assisting him.

1 Zafarul Hasan was an applicant for the fellowship and wanted Mohamed Ali to support his application. In July 1917 he wrote again saying that Nawab Ishaq Khan had not circulated his papers and feared that the fellowship will not come through probably because his application was being backed by the Ali Brothers and Ansari. See his correspondence with Mohamed Ali on 14 June, 11 July and 16 July 1917 in MAP (7).

13. From Ziauddin Ahmad Barni

Kanpur
20 July 1917

I am writing to you after a long time, but please don't allow this thought to enter your mind that I have forgotten you. Let my right hand forget its function, if ever I forget you.

Tomorrow is *Id*—the happiest day in the life of a Muslim, and you will, under the present circumstances, naturally feel lonely. But I, as a humble member of the great Muslim community assure you that the good wishes of the Muslims are with you. We all feel your absence very much, but I believe that before long you will be in our midst.

Your sad plight reminds me of the trials and hardships through which the Muslims of today are passing. Islam, you know well, never despairs, and so we also should on no account despair. I believe in the moral order of things and therefore my faith is that good will come out of evil.

You will be glad to know that I have passed the M.A. (Previous) Examination in Persian. For my final I propose to appear in 1919.

Convey my *Id* greetings and compliments to Mr. Shaukat Ali.

Wishing you a happy *Id. ID MUBARAK* [In Urdu]

14. To F.S.A. Slocock

Chhindwara
30 August 1917

I cannot repress the expression of great surprise at the fact that a whole week has been allowed to pass without according me permission to visit Lucknow.[1] To the telegrams of the

1 Mohamed Ali had sought permission to visit Lucknow to 'arrange the affairs of my late friend and comrade', Raja Ghulam Husain.

23rd and 24th instant a reply was received by me from the Deputy Commissioner here intimating that you had referred my application to the Government of India whose orders were awaited. Since the order of internment issued by this local administration, dated 16 November 1915, which was served on me at the railway station of Jabalpur on the 22nd idem, clearly states that it is only the previous sanction in writing of the Chief Secretary that I need if I desire to move from the boundaries of the Chhindwara Municipality. I applied to you in this emergency by wire and expected that you would wire back the necessary permission to me. I had explained in my wires of the 23rd and 24th instant the condition of my friend who had that tragic, and, as it subsequently proved, fatal accident at Lucknow,[2] and I could not imagine that I would be left to experience all the anguish and suspense that I did for want even of an acknowledgement by wire and the intimation conveyed two days later through the Deputy Commissioner that you had thought fit to refer the matter to the Government of India.

Even this belated intimation came too late, for the same day that I received it, but some hours previously, came the terrible news that my dear friend and comrade had expired. I had already submitted to the censor here the third telegram addressed to you (on the 25th instant) after having failed to hear from you in reply to the telegram of the 23rd and 24th, expressing great astonishment at your silence, when the D.C. informed me that the matter had been referred to the Government of India and, consequently I substituted words therein to show that I had received this intimation. But I had already stated very clearly in the telegram that the death of my friend and comrade did not alter my desire to go to Lucknow, as now I had to settle his affairs and arrange financial and other assistance for the poor stricken widow with two infants that my young and luckless friend had so suddenly and without any warning left behind him to mourn his tragic fate.

To this telegram no reply of any sort has been vouchsafed these five days, and I have been left to ruin my already shattered health, to which my dear friend's sad and sudden death has been such a heavy blow, by worrying over the

2 Ghulam Husain fell from a runaway horse at Lucknow and died.

troubles of the poor inexperienced widow whose telegram to me announcing the death of her husband clearly indicated, what I had already realised sufficiently, that she looked to me to make all necessary arrangements for her support and the bringing up of her little children.

As it is possible that you are not aware in what relationship the poor widow stands to me, I write to say that it was my wife and I who had while we were all at Delhi arranged my late friend's marriage with this lady who is a relative of the late Sir Syed Ahmad Khan and comes from Delhi, and that were it not for our acting almost *in loco parentis* to the bridegroom as we did, he, who came from another province and was previously little known in Delhi, would have found it difficult to marry this lady.

As for the late Mr. Ghulam Husain (whom I have known for 12 years), he came to be more intimately associated with me since 1911, when he joined the *Comrade* staff at Calcutta soon after the paper commenced publication. He lived with me while there, except for the fact that I rented for him a separate set of rooms owing to the scantiness of accommodation in my own house...But as he was never regarded in the light of a mere employee of mine, but as a younger brother and a dear friend and colleague,[3] I now added to the amount I used to pay him at Calcutta for his pocket expenses etc., another sum for his boarding and lodging expenses, and when subsequently, in 1914, I persuaded him to remarry and arranged this match, I added another sum to his monthly allowance in order to enable him to defray the additional cost of a married household, quite irrespective of his additional usefulness to me and the *Comrade*. And although the *Comrade* ceased publication only a few weeks after his wedding, he continued to receive

3 Malik Barkat Ali, editor of the Lahore *Observer*, wrote to Mohamed Ali on 29 August 1917 :

"The sad death of Ghulam Husain overwhelmed me with so much grief that I really could not do anything for a couple of days afterwards. Even now my head moves heavily. In view of the fact that Ghulam Husain was to you more than a brother, I deem it a duty to convey to you my heartfelt sympathy with you in the grief and anguish which Ghulam Husain's sudden removal to the unknown must have caused to you."

Barkat Ali to Mohamed Ali, 29 August 1919, L. 3216, MAP (7).

the same amount that he was getting after his marriage for nearly a year afterwards, and it was only when even the *Hamdard* was censored out of existence about two years ago and I could no longer pretend and deceive him that his services were still indispensable to me and my publications and just as valuable as when he sub-edited the *Comrade* with such brilliance and ability, and he himself insisted on going out into the world to seek his fortune, that he ceased to draw his usual allowance of Rs 200 a month from me. For some time he could not secure any employment, and when he did at last secure it, I had considerable share in assisting him to do so

All this I mention merely to show to what extent I have always regarded his private and personal interests as my own, and how natural it is for his poor young widow, so hopelessly at sea now after his sudden and untimely death, to look up to me even in my interned state for support and guidance. When announcing to me her husband's death she pathetically asked me in her wire who was to "patronise" the baby boy born only a month or two ago that my late friend has left, along with a girl two years old to keep his memory alive, and yet to add not a little to the poor widow cares and troubles in life. Of course by "patronising" she meant acting as one on whom the child could depend for support and upbringing as on a father or other "*murabbi*".

I think I should not keep back the fact from you that at one time I felt that it would be less painful to me in anticipation of your sanction even to proceed to Lucknow to catch if only a last glimpse of my young friend on his death-bed and utter something to show how I felt for him and for myself at that time, and assure him that so long as I and mine had a crust to eat or a rag to cover our persons his wife and children would share it with us to the end of our lives, although subsequently I had to suffer the extreme penalty attaching to a breach of the internment regulations, then to wait in suspense for your delayed sanction at the risk of reaching Lucknow too late. The same feeling was uppermost in my mind when the poor heart-broken widow's pathetic wire reached me. But my brother, Mr. Shaukat Ali, counselled me to remain patient, particularly as he feared such action on my part might be made out by our enemies to have been prompted by a desire to increase public excitement already so

great on account of the repressive policy of so many local Governments and Administrations.

I have therefore waited most patiently for a whole week, and I must say that I was entitled to an earlier decision of such an urgent request not to say also a favourable one, for no other decision is possible without exhibiting the authorities as callous and indolent spectators of the tragedies of those whom they had previously robbed of their liberties.[4]

I recall with no little pain the refusal of Sir James Meston and the Chief Secretary, Mr. Burn, to let me visit Rampur two years ago when one of my daughters was dangerously ill, and I was at Lansdowne and desired to see her, and if possible to remove her to Delhi for consultation with the doctors and *hakeems*. I was kept in suspense for a long while in spite of repeated wires, and only when after despairing of Government's sanction of my proposed visit my wife had already taken the child over to Delhi herself, was I informed by government that the doctor and the *hakeem* whom I had specially desired to consult had by then gone to Rampur and my wife could consult them there. Presumably, I, as the other parent, had no *locus standi* and no feelings in the matter. In the meantime another child had a severe attack of cholera, and realising from the application already made and the absence of any response from government for so many days my helplessness, and desiring to spare me in my shattered state of health so much impotent rage, my wife had mentioned nothing to me about this other incident. In any case it would have been futile, for cholera and such diseases give their decision obviously with greater promptness and are mercifully swift in setting the fate of their victims.

Here too, we had occasion to apply for permission to visit Rampur when the wife of one brother and the daughter of another—in the latter case, Mr. Shaukat Ali—had typhoid. The same delay took place then also, and the same reference was deemed necessary to the Supreme Government on the heights of the Himalayas. But all that proved equally futile, and permission

4 In response to Mohamed Ali's second letter of 2 September, he was informed that the government considered his visit to Lucknow 'unnecessary as the friends of Mr. Ghulam Husain will be able to do all that is necessary for the purpose of making arrangements for his family'. Wilayatullah to Mohamed Ali, 3 September 1917, I. 3231, MAP (7).

was refused. Subsequently we came to know that an inquisitory visit by the State doctor at Rampur was deemed necessary to verify our statement as regards the illness, and perhaps it was because the patient had by then passed the crises successfully and the doctor had certified it, that the permission applied for was refused. In this connection I am tempted to ask what it is that the government desires. Is it to be the rule that permission is not to be given to visit a sick friend or relation if there is any prospect of recovery, and that it is to be deemed of no earthly good if the patient dies, as in the present case, by the time the Chief Secretary, the local administration, and the Governor-General-in-Council have all, after due deliberation and a consultation with the experts arrived at a decision.

I am writing at a time and under circumstances of the greatest pain and anguish ; and I feel that I am entitled to know definitely whether it was ever contemplated that the Chief Secretary should give us the sanction to move beyond the limits of our prison-house, or whether the proviso had been inserted in the order condemning us to this exile merely for the sake of effect. If any circumstances were contemplated at the time of its insertion when it should become applicable, then I should like to know whether they were of a more tragic character than the dangerous illness of a child, a niece and sister-in-law and a most shocking accident to a very dear friend and comrade. My unaided judgement is incapable of assisting me in solving this mystery and in my helplessness I approach you with all the respect and humility that a distracted being like myself can command in the hope that you would at least provide some clue.

Before I close this letter let me just add one word about these frequent references to higher authorities. We have been interned these 27 months and more, and surely it was time that government knew its own mind about us and gave clear and final instructions to those whom it considered more properly qualified to control our lives than ourselves. And yet every day we see the local censor referring our letter to the secretariat at Nagpur and Pachmari and the Deputy Commissioner referring to the L.A. our applications to receive outside guests, which we were assured were to be merely of a formal nature intended to keep the D.C. informed as to who our

outside visitors were, and the local administrative and the Chief Secretary in their turn referring everything to the Government of India and that we were given to understand by the Defence of India Rules and the orders of internment issued thereunder were within their own competence. Soon after our internment Lord Hardinge had given our friends to understand that the Defence of India Rules had placed the question of our internments within the sole competence of the local governments to the exclusion even of himself, and that he could not intrude his benevolent and beneficent personality in that matter much as he sympathised with us and regretted the action of the Chief Commissioner of Delhi. And yet, just when the Chief Commissioner had thrice refused to give us any allowance to maintain an extra establishment owing to our internment—there was no question of any other allowance then, as my sources of income had not till then been affected—and the Muslims of Delhi and Lucknow alone had determined to contribute respectively Rs 500 monthly towards the expenses of each of us, the late Viceroy intervened, though we regret to have to say that the amounts then fixed for our subsistence were the paltry sums of Rs 100 a month for my brother, who had been used to an expenditure of about Rs 800 a month when in government employ, and Rs 250 a month for myself, when it must have been within His Excellency's knowledge and that of his Council that I had been spending at the old and new capitals of India where members of government themselves resided at least for part of the year, nothing short of thrice the amount of my allowance, not to mention what my brother and I earned and hoped to earn. Similarly, the Government of India has intervened on other occasions also, but never once to enlarge the bounds of our restricted freedom, and invariably to restrict them still further. It, therefore, seems that, while powerless for good, everyone, from the local officers upwards, is only too potent for evil. In that case the more straightforward course would be to say so and make an end of it for all time. In the case of permission to move out of the municipal limits of this out of the way corner of India which has been selected with evident care and thoughtfulness for our exile, I submit it would be better to leave the Government of India to deal with us and our applications to go outside Chhindwara without the intervention of the local government and the C.P. Secretariat. It would spare

us all this suspense and you so much circumlocution. The multiplication of media of communication cannot obviously result in dispatch and efficiency.

It is in no carping spirit that I make this suggestion, but chiefly with a view to be helpful and reduce your labours as well as mine while it is still the pleasure of those in authority to keep us deprived of our full liberty.

I do not, however, desire that permission for which we have already applied should be delayed pending the settlement of this question or of the main question of setting us free now that there can be no doubt that our internment 27 months ago did not increase public tranquillity but, on the contrary, disturbed it very considerably.

Trusting that the sanction applied for would be received by wire early enough tomorrow.

15. From A.K. Fazlul Haq

30 Marsden Street
Calcutta
7 September 1917

Need I tell you with what feelings of ecstacy your numerous friends all over India have received the announcement of Government to permit you to return to the longing arms of your co-religionists ? I pray to God that not a second more than is absolutely necessary may stand between us and the happy hour of your release.

It will be bewildering for you to gratify the wishes of all your friends and admirers to have a personal look at you and to shake your warm hands once again. It may be that you will have to roam about all over India for this purpose. I therefore write to say that Calcutta ventures to claim some attention at your hands, and that it will be a grievous disappointment to all of us here if you do not include this city in the list of the foremost places which you may intend to visit. I shall deem it a great honour if you kindly take these few lines as an invitation coming from the depths of the heart for you to visit Calcutta.

16. From Syed Mahmud

Bankipur
22 September 1917

You both must be angry with me I know. We shall however settle our account when we meet. But in the meanwhile please let me know by return what is your programme on release ?[1] Where do you go first ? I am informed that you intend to come down to Calcutta immediately on your release. If so, please don't fail to drop me a line a few days before. The Muslims here, nay the whole of Bihar, is dying to see you both.

1 On 28 September, G.L. Corbett, who assumed charge on 24 September, informed Mohamed Ali of the government's refusal to release him and his brother. Mohamed Ali informed Corbett on 27 September of his daughter's illness and made enquiries about government's decision to release him and Shaukat Ali. 'We have waited patiently enough for 28 months and more', he wrote, 'but my child cannot wait here indefinitely'. Mohamed to Corbett, 27 September 1917, L 3271, MAP (7).

17. From Bhagwan Das[1]
Chairman
Home Rule League
Banaras

Banaras City
22 September 1917

Resolution No. IV passed at a public meeting held under the auspices of the Home Rule League, Banaras, on Thursday, the 20 September 1917.

1 Bhagwan Das (1869-1959) belonged to Banaras where he developed close interest in social and educational matters. He was an ardent advocate of communal harmony and of the religious unity of all religions, a subject on which he wrote extensively. Bhagwan Das was also involved in Congress activities in U.P.

IV. That this meeting heartily congratulates Messrs Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali on their release after a long period of suffering and welcomes their restoration to public life as a great source of strength to the national cause.

18. To G.L. Corbett

Chhindwara
30 September 1917

I apply for your formal sanction to receiving my friend Mr. Tassaduq Ahmad Khan Sherwani, B.A. (Cantab), Barrister-at-Law of Aligarh as my guest.[1] He is not exactly a relation ; but quite as dear as any relative of ours. He is an old Boy of our College at Aligarh and was a very small boy when I graduated.[2] We have known him and—loved him—since then, and he has been a consistent visitor at our place. While we were interned at Lansdowne he visited us just about this time 2 years ago. He had long been thinking of coming over here; but had had to put the visit off more than once. Now that he is at last on his way his visit is very opportune, for my brother has to negotiate through him the sale or lease of his Cotton Ginning Factory and Press to his cousin Khan Bahadur Nawab Muzammilullah Khan Sherwani of Aligarh[3] who works several factories of his own. I hope we have your permission.

Thanks for your sympathy in our illness. Yes, misfortunes never come singly and I suppose malaria and September chills

1 The visit of T.A.K. Sherwani was 'sanctioned'. Corbett to Mohamed Ali, 1 October 1917, L 3296, MAP (7).

2 He graduated from Aligarh and was a contemporary of Jawaharlal Nehru at Cambridge. He was elected trustee of Aligarh in 1916.

3 The Nawab (1865-1938) was a Sherwani Pathan and a leading land-owner in Aligarh and Etah districts. He was elected an Aligarh trustee in 1886; nominated to the U.P. legislative council, 1916; nominated member of the Viceroy's Council of State and twice Home Member of the U.P. government.

must be classed as misfortunes, though very minor ones. But we don't blame the air of Chhindwara for that. It is healthy enough, pretty enough and quiet enough to suit us in our present position. Its only drawback is its distance from everywhere and its inaccessibility, and if "any change of air" is desirable for all of us, it is to Rampur, our far off home! For that we await—with patience.

19. To G.L. Corbett

1 October 1917

Syed Raza Ali[1] is not my brother-in-law, but an old friend and Old Boy of our College with whom my wife and children would put up at Allahabad on their way home, as I mentioned only yesterday in my letter to him. He has often acted as legal adviser of our family and I welcome his visit as we desire to take legal advice regarding a representation that we shall address to Govt. on the subject of our internment. I hope we have your formal sanction to receive him as our guest.

As regards Mr. Tassaduq Ahmad Khan, he is expected tonight, but I can't say how long he would be able to spare for us, though I fear it may not be more than a couple of days.[2]

1 Syed Raza Ali (1882) was a graduate of M.A.O. College, Aligarh. He was closely associated with the Muslim League, the Aligarh Muslim University movement, and the Khilafat agitation in India. He was a member of U.P. legislative council from 1912 to 1925, and led Muslim delegations to the Viceroy over Turkey in 1922 and 1923.

2 Corbett informed Mohamed Ali that the visit of T.A.K. Sherwani was 'sanctioned', but that of Syed Raza Ali 'is refused in the absence of private reasons'. Corbett to Mohamed Ali, 1 October 1917, L 3296, MAP (7).

**20. From Secretary
Home Rule League
Shahjahanpur**

1 October 1917

Resolution passed unanimously in a public meeting of the citizens of Shahjahanpur held on 1st October 1917.

"That this public meeting of the citizens of Shahjahanpur express their regret at the vague and unsatisfactory reasons given by the Home Member concerning Messrs Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali's internment and request His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General-in-Council to make orders for their immediate release."

21. To G. L. Corbett

Chhindwara
1 October 1917

With reference to your letter just received[1] I have to say that there should be no misunderstanding if the orders issued to us under the Defence of India Rules are the same as the orders issued to you and your predecessors.

We were interned on the 16th May 1915; but until the orders to which I shall presently refer were received here on the 3rd February 1916, we were as free as anybody else to receive visits from all sorts of people. Then for the first time an order was received without the least warning and for no reason that we could discover in our own conduct or otherwise, requiring us to "receive no visitors other than persons residing within the town of Chhindwara without permission

1 This refers to the letter of 1 October explaining that Corbett did not have the authority to grant permission to outside visitors. 'If then', wrote Corbett to Mohamed Ali, 'you do not apply for permission until your friends are just starting or have actually started, there is not sufficient time to get the previous sanction before their arrival, and your friends are likely to be subjected to disappointment and inconvenience'. Corbett to Mohamed Ali, 1 October 1917, L 3292, MAP (7).

previously obtained from the Deputy Commissioner, Chhindwara".[2]

Against this uncalled for interference with our liberty we intended to protest; but the first necessity was to warn our relations and friends whose visits had for some months past been put off, because, owing to the entire absence of furniture in the house which Govt. had rented for us here, we were not in a position to receive them earlier in the cold weather. So we sent to the Chief Secretary, with a view to obtain his sanction for its publication, a warning to our friends and others intending to pay us a visit that in view of the new orders, they should come "prepared for the possibility of our request to be allowed to receive them not being acceded to by the Deputy Commissioner of Chhindwara".

Now mark the reply of the local administration as communicated to us by the D.C. on the 14th February, 1917. "I am directed to inform you that the object of the order was not to place restrictions on your receiving visits from such persons but to enable the Deputy Commissioner to keep himself informed as to who your outside visitors are". And, very rightly, he concludes by assuring us that "in the circumstances the Chief Commissioner sees no necessity to forward on the press notice submitted with your letter".

That's clear and explicit enough, and if there is any misunderstanding, I am sure you will absolve us from all responsibility for it.

Under the only orders issued to us with the authority of the Defence of India Rules the D.C. is the only authority whose permission we are required to take before receiving outside visitors. And the letter from which I have quoted above provides the official interpretation, so that all warning to intending visitors, whether relative, friends or others, is "in the circumstances" declared to be unnecessary.

We have always satisfied the requirements of all the orders that we have received and hope to do so in the future also. If there are any recent orders, we are not aware of them, and since they have not been issued to us, we cannot be expected to comply with them. As soon as we receive information that

2 This order was served on 3 February 1916.

a friend or relative—or for that matter any other person either —intends to pay us a visit, we apply for permission to receive him as a guest of ours and as all our letters and telegrams pass through the D.C. as censor, he receives the intimation even before we do it. This enables him to keep himself informed who our outside visitors are, which was all that the new order received in February 1916, was explicitly intended for. We certainly know nothing of any discrimination to be exercised by anybody between our relatives and our friends, some of whom are dearer to us than many a relative, and all of whom are very dear to us indeed.

In the cases under reference we have complied with the requirements of the orders issued to us and have enabled you to keep yourself fully informed as to who our intending outside visitors are, and I am sure in this you will agree with me. I shall only add that I trust nothing will be done to make it difficult for us to receive such legal assistance as we need in order that justice may be done to us.[3]

3 The reply was : 'The orders to which I referred, were issued to the D.C. in July last to guide him in granting permission to receive visitors, and allow him no discretion. I do not know the circumstances under which the restrictions were tightened. But I certainly think that it would have been better, and would have avoided misunderstandings, if the regulations by which the D.C. is now bound, had been made clear to you before'. Corbett to Mohamed Ali, 1 October 1917, L 3290, MAP (7).

22. To James DuBoulay[1]

Chhindwara
24 October 1917

I have been thinking of writing this letter for some time, but what I desire to say has been so difficult to compress within

1 James Houssmayne DuBoulay (b. 1868) was educated in Winchester and Balliol College before joining the I.C.S. as Assistant Collector and Magistrate of Bombay. He was Secretary to Government of Bombay, 1909, and Private Secretary to Hardinge from 1910 until his appointment as Home Member.

the ordinary dimensions of a letter that it could not be written earlier, and even now I am far from certain that I shall be able to convey to you what we feel.[2]

I have learnt from the local administration that it had forwarded to you a telegram of ours addressed to the Raja Saheb of Mahmudabad and Messrs Jinnah and Mazharul Haq in which, after denying the authorship of such treasonable letters as had been attributed to us, we had requested that they might be shown to us.[3]

In this connection I should like to declare once more that neither of us had any share in the composition or transmission of any treasonable communication or document of any kind, that neither of us has sent at any time any communication of a political or public nature to His Majesty the Amir of Kabul or any one else in Afghanistan,[4] and that

2 Corbett wrote on 24 October expressing his appreciation of Mohamed Ali's letter to DuBoulay. He continued :

"It seems to me, however, that certain questions will arise ; and it has occurred to me that you might prefer that your intention should be interpreted through me than through some other channels. I am, of course, a very unimportant person, and I am in no way behind the scenes. I know no more about the inner history of your affairs than you have yourself told me. But you probably will not consider it a disadvantage that I am more or less a free-lance in this matter, and can bring to it an unbiased mind.

If you would care to discuss the matter with me, please come round any time tomorrow. But if you would prefer me to send you letter straight on without discussion, please say so, and I shall quite understand.

In any case, please do not think me impertinent, and believe that my only desire is to get the thing cleared up."

Corbett to Mohamed Ali, 24 October 1917, L 3349, MAP (7).

3 See Enclosure : 1.

4 On 4 October 1917, B. Ghate, a Bombay based pleader, informed Jinnah that his clients—the Ali Brothers—deny authorship of any letters which involved them in 'treasonable conduct'. The government denied being in possession of the 'treasonable letters', including the one supposedly addressed to the Amir of Afghanistan. 'Government have satisfied themselves', wrote DuBoulay to Jinnah, 'of the pro-Turkish and anti-British sympathies with which the brothers are inspired partly from the published writings for which Mohamed Ali is responsible and partly from other evidence in their possession ; but they have never seen or received any information of the existence of any such letter as is referred to in this rumour and have not therefore rested any suspicion on either of the brothers in connection with it'. Home Poll, D, January 1918, 6, NAI.

neither of us has sent throughout the period of our internment here or in the United Provinces any uncensored letter such as we have recently been informed my brother is alleged to have addressed to our spiritual advisor, Maulana Abdul Bari Saheb of Firangi Mahal, Lucknow.

There is another and still more important matter to which I would also like to refer. We have been greatly pained to note that strange meanings have been attached to some very simple words that we had added to the undertaking required from us and they too came in the way of our expected release.

Circumstanced as we were, and having regard to these difficult and abnormal times, and the apparently wide scope of the undertaking required from us, it seemed to us that all future misunderstanding would be avoided if we invited the attention of government to our recognised religious beliefs and practices by adding those words, and we could not conceive that any sinister significance would be imported into them. I am sure you have known us sufficiently long to be able to add to this statement of ours your own testimony also that we are frank to a fault and that all our dealings have been fair and above board. We can therefore safely leave it to you to judge whether sinister mental reservation of the kind so strangely suspected are in our line. I need hardly add that the indication of such sinister reservation in the manner suspected would not have done credit to the meanest intelligence.

Many of our friends have, however, rightly pointed out to us that the fullest religious freedom is already guaranteed to every subject of His Majesty, and that the addition which we had made was therefore unnecessary and superfluous.

We hope this should entirely satisfy you that we are not only God-fearing Muslims but also patriotic citizens of the Empire and loyal subjects of the King-Emperor and that no danger to public safety can be apprehended from our release.

A memorable declaration has been made regarding the goal of British policy in India,[5] and all the auspices seem

5 The reference is to the Secretary of State Montagu's declaration of August 1917 to the effect that self-government on the Dominion model was the goal for India.

good for the future if only public tranquillity was fully assured. For our part we are as anxious as any one else that there should be as little excitement in the country at this important juncture as possible and are prepared to cooperate with government very heartily to this end.

I shall only add that I have a personal interest too in the suppression of all needless excitement, for my health which has never been very good for some years past, is just now as bad as it well could be and the excitement of the last few months has greatly aggravated my diabetes, and, what I feel still more deeply, it has played havoc with the health of my mother, whom we should like to spare all worry at this time of life, when worry very nearly spells death. I therefore hope that government would review their recent decision in the light of this statement and finally decide our cases at an early date.

Apologising for the length of this letter.

Enclosure : 1

4 October 1917

[Telegram]*

We had for the first time on the 9th September last heard from the Raja Saheb of Mahmudabad of two letters now said to be in the possession of Government which involved their authors in treasonable conduct and were alleged to be ours. We immediately and emphatically denied authorship of any such letters. Subsequently we heard from others of similar vague allegations attributing to Mohamed Ali a treasonable

*Home Poll. A, January 1919, 206 and K.W. This telegram was addressed to the Raja of Mahmudabad, Jinnah and Mazharul Haq. In urging Corbett to forward this telegram, Mohamad Ali expressed the hope that it would be passed 'as it relates exclusively to our private affairs, and I am confident that you agree that the sooner the Government hears authoritatively that we emphatically repudiate the vague allegations that have done us apparently no end of harm the oetter'.

letter in Persian addressed to His Majesty the Amir of Afghanistan and another in Urdu addressed by one of us to somebody else. This too we both immediately and emphatically denied. Now once for all we hereby most emphatically deny jointly and severally authorship of any such letters or any other responsibility for them and request Government through you to let us see the letters said to be in its possession to enable us to affirm or deny their authorship as God-fearing Muslims.

Mohamed Ali
Shaukat Ali

23. To Editor, *Pioneer*

Chhindwara
12 October 1917

It appears that in your issue of Monday last, while commenting on the address presented to Mrs. Besant by the Home Rule League of Allahabad, you stated as follows :

> What, too, are we to make of this extraordinary license allowed to anyone and everyone to go on agitating for the release of men whose connection with the King's enemies has been fully established to the satisfaction of Government ? Surely the time has come for Government to make up its mind to govern.

May we request you to state whether it is to us that you refer in the passage quoted above ? If so, and there seems to be no doubt that it is so, may we request you to state also the nature of our connection with the King's enemies, the particular enemies with whom we are alleged to have connection, the manner in which it has been fully established and the particular government to whose satisfaction it has been so established.

We trust you will admit that it would be far more straightforward as well as far more satisfactory to all concerned to specify all this than to defame us merely by such innuendoes.

24. From G.L. Corbett

25 October 1917

I have been thinking about your case during the night; and on reconsideration I have come to the conclusion that it will be better for me to forward your letters to the Home Member without any previous discussion between us.

My point is that the controversy seems to be getting side-tracked into events of the past—"previous papers" and so on, —when the only thing that matters is the future; that is, whether your release would or would not be likely to hamper the Empire in carrying on the War.

The proviso which you made to the undertaking required of you, suggested that your release would, or in certain circumstances might, hamper the Empire in carrying on the war. You wish to convince Govt. that your proviso should convey no such suggestion. Your letter may or may not have that effect. But if it does not, I think it will be better that your intention should be ascertained through responsible Muslim leaders, who will carry more weight both with you and with government than I do. I intend to represent this to government when forwarding your letter.

25. To G.L. Corbett

25 October 1917

I received your letter too late last night on our return home with our guests to answer it the same day and hasten to do it now.

I am glad you like my letter to Sir James DuBoulay. He has known me fairly intimately for a number of years when I had frequently to consult him and confer with him as the Private Secretary of Lord Hardinge and during the Balkan War I had many occasions to seek through him the Viceroy's assistance in connection with the Medical Mission and the

Turkish Relief Fund and the sale of Ottoman goods. I therefore hope that he would be able to interpret me in the light of his personal knowledge.

As for seeing you, we should be very glad to come and would have done so just now. But Thursday happens to be a bad day with us for going out as we fast on that day. Even then we would have come, but we have an important engagement to keep this morning—the third day ceremony after the death of a friend's only child, a daughter who died in childbirth here the day before yesterday. Our friend came to see us yesterday and invited us specially as he needs our assistance with settlement of a charity in connection with his daughter's death. We are off to the Juma Masjid just now and don't expect to be back before 10 or 11, when I am afraid we shall have to look after our poor mother who has been very ill for the last three days.

Do you mind if we see you tomorrow morning tho' I am afraid I shall be fasting tomorrow also owing to Muharram. But fasting doesn't matter early in the morning.

However, I would request you to have the letter posted today as it is particularly necessary that it should reach Sir James DuBoulay as early as possible. They are all leaving Simla before the end of this month and I want Sir James to get it before the Government of India packs up and they meet the Viceroy on his return to Delhi. If you at all prefer to see us today we would come round any time after 11.

I am sending you some stamps as I fear the letter went unstamped. I have asked my man to buy a stampbook and leave that also with you.

26. To G.L. Corbett[1]

Chhindwara
12 November 1917

As you are perhaps aware, I have been elected at a joint meeting of the All-India Congress Committee and the Council

1 A copy of this letter was also sent to the Chief Secretary, but on 27 November Mohamed Ali's request was turned down. Corbett to Mohamed Ali, 27 November 1917, L 3389, MAP (7).

of the All-India Muslim League held last month at Allahabad a member of the Deputation representing these bodies which is to wait on his Majesty's Secretary of State for India and his companions and the Governor-General in connection with a scheme of reforms jointly prepared by these bodies.

It has now been announced that the deputation will be received on some day between the 15th and the 20th instant, and the members have been requested to keep themselves in readiness to start for Delhi on the receipt of telegraphic intimation of the precise date fixed.

I request you to permit me to proceed to Delhi in this connection in time to take part in the reception of the deputation, after which I shall return to Chhindwara without delay.

In view of the brief notice received I regret I could not apply for the necessary permission earlier, and hope it would be accorded by wire and without avoidable delay.

27. To G.L. Corbett

Chhindwara
12 November 1917

I write to inform you that I have read today in the press your announcement regarding the reception of the joint deputation of the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League,[1] elected last month at Allahabad, by the Secretary of State for India and his companions and Viceroy at Delhi, but since I am not permitted, according to the terms of my internment order, to move beyond the municipal limits of Chhindwara unless I receive the previous sanction of the Chief Secretary to the Chief Commissioner, I have today applied to him for necessary sanction.[2]

1 The deputationists submitted the Congress-League Scheme of reforms. In his 'Indian Diary', Montagu noted his meeting "with the real giants in the Indian political world". There is no reference to the deputation.

2 Mohamed Ali also wrote to the Chief Secretary on the same day i.e., 12 November 1917. The letter was forwarded by Corbett on 13 November. On 17 November, the Ali Brothers were refused permission to meet the Secretary of State.

I may add in this connection that I was informed by the Censor that a Memorandum in connection with this deputation and the joint scheme of reforms[3] which had been addressed to me by Mr. Chintamani and a telegram asking me whether I approved of it or not had been withheld by him under the standing orders relating to our correspondence.[4] Since then another cover addressed to me by Mr. Chintamani has also not been returned to me by the Censor. I write this merely to inform you, so that you may understand why I have been silent.

3 This refers to the reform scheme adopted by the Muslim League Reform Committee and the All-India Congress Committee in November 1916. The Scheme was subsequently ratified at the Lucknow session of the Congress and the Muslim League in December.

4 'This is, of course, purely political, and under standing orders I am bound to withhold it', wrote Corbett. Corbett to Mohamed Ali, 1 November 1917, L 3371, MAP (7).

28. To G.L. Corbett

Chhindwara
12 November 1917

On October 12, we had forwarded to you through the Deputy Commissioner of Chhindwara as required by our internment orders a letter which we had addressed to the Editor of the *Pioneer* newspaper of Allahabad for publication asking for certain essential information regarding a grossly libellous statement it had published against us a little previously. We had hoped that permission to have that letter published would be readily accorded; but to our surprise no reply has yet been received nor has any acknowledgement been vouchsafed.

Since then another libellous statement has been published by the Editor of the *Pioneer* against us.

We would now request you to accord to us the necessary sanction to have the letter submitted to you a month ago published as soon as the matter has been sufficiently considered by you and a decision has finally been arrived at.

An early reply would be greatly appreciated.

29. To G.L. Corbett

Chhindwara
21 January 1918

I intended to write to you much earlier, but I had another attack of fever accompanied with a bad cough and cold which confined me once more to my bed for a couple of days, and to my room for more than a week subsequently, and it is only now that I can muster sufficient strength of will to sit down to write a letter or two. I have heard a great deal of the work on which you have recently been engaged, and am surely tempted to inflict on you a good many 'sermons' on the duties of the bureaucrats and other angels and ministers of grace, but schooled by this internment I desist, and confine this to purely 'domestic and business affairs' as the regulations put it.

Will you kindly let me know on what grounds permission has been refused to us to receive our spiritual advisor, Maulana Abdul Bari Saheb, as a visitor.[1] You have already told us that since July, 1917, the Deputy Commissioner has been deprived of the discretion to permit persons other than relatives being received as visitors, and therefore I do not wish to suggest in the least that responsibility for this refusal was yours. But since we are to look to the D.C only, we must complain to you in every such case. In view of the clear understanding when the order relating to visitors was received about 2 years ago that it was not intended to restrict our freedom to receive visitors, but merely to keep the D.C. informed as to who our outside visitors were, we consider the refusal to be a distinct breach of faith which does not improve because permission has in this case been refused to our religious preceptor to visit us. Hardly any better was the case when two members of the Bar who desired to give us much needed legal advice and assistance were similarly refused permission last October. I was informed by Mr. Syed Raza Ali that he and Mr. Zahur Ahmad had jointly addressed a

1 Mohamed Ali was informed by G.L. Corbett on 28 December 1917 that permission to receive Abdul Bari 'has been refused'. L 5173, MAP (7). Earlier, a long letter to Abdul Bari was withheld by the Chief Secretary. Wilayatullah to Mohamed Ali, 26 August 1917, L 3211, MAP (7).

protest against this refusal to you and had requested you to forward it to the local administration which you had readily promised to do. I had expected that after that permission would not be refused in future, and had not therefore personally protested. But it is now clear that, apart from the vexatious delay in getting permission from the local administration when the order distinctly told us that it would be the D.C.—a local officer—who would give it, our freedom to receive visitors is being restricted, the government assurance following on the order notwithstanding, and that the order is being worked not merely for the purpose of keeping the D.C. informed as we were clearly and in these very words assured at the time. We therefore protest against the misuse of the order and trust that it would not be so misused hereafter. We again apply for permission to receive Maulana Abdul Bari Saheb and hope you will readily accord it in the spirit of the assurance conveyed to us through one of your predecessors.

Coming to more 'domestic' matters, I would request you to sanction the cost of four *Niwar* beds with mattresses, the repair and renewal of some furniture and the payment to us of the cost of a lantern and of the re-caning of some chairs already paid by us, owing to the urgency of the thing, in your absence.

When we first came here there were only we two and our mother, my wife and four of my suffragettes, big and small, and only one of my brother's children, the first-born Zahid who is already known to you. We therefore got 10 *Niwar* beds and retained the two old iron beds of the P.W.D. (Public Works Department) that were first sent to us. The last have proved a great nuisance as 'springs' come off on the least provocation and often without any, and none of any weight ever consents to use one of them. Now that my brother's two other boys and two girls have also been here for many months past we have had to pair some of the children even normally; but when a guest or two turn up, I leave you to picture to yourself the difficulties we have to experience. For some time we used to borrow a couple of beds from the town, but we have had ample reason to repent of this since an army or two of 'residents of Chhindwara' were thus surreptitiously introduced into our poor 'alien' and exiled household. These made sleep an impossibility even to such a pachyderm as

myself used to any amount of 'pin-pricks'. The winter has lessened the fury of these belligerent interlopers, and we live in hopes of exterminating them before spring and a more acute phase of their warfare return. But that would hardly avail us much if reserves and reinforcements arrive again from the town depot with the arrival of a guest. I have already a cousin of mine—a lady—staying with us since the return of my wife and children, and the Bed Question has already assumed sufficient proportions to deserve Capitala. If we get the four *Niwar* beds now asked for we shall only too gladly return the two P.W.D. ironclads, and shall then have 14 beds between the baker's dozen of our normal household, not counting the servants, nor even the governess and the boys' tutor and the nurse. As a matter of fact we could do very well with another two of your funds and 'war economy' permit.

As regards furniture, we are sorry it was ordered from Calcutta, the last place in the world for any kind of furniture, and particularly for the variety known as cheap but not nasty, Bombay is a far better place as we told Mr. Chitnavis though only after it had already been ordered from Calcutta. The result has been that many chairs are among the 'casualties', including some that had been patched up once before this. Four of these have been recaned last week in anticipation of the return of my family, and we have paid Rs. 4 for them. But the dining chairs are the worst. I don't know who it was that thought of Bent Wood chairs for such hefty weights as my brother and myself, and some of my suffragettes. Anyhow there they are, with legs that have dropped off, and with many a screw far too loose if not already 'missing'. So for the present we all squat down in true oriental fashion for all our meals in the 'Drawing Room'—so called as a matter of mere courtesy—as that is the only carpeted room we have in the house, besides the 'study' now serving my brother for a bed room as well. If you will request your *locum tenens* to get from us our requirements and order what can be made locally from the local carpenters and the rest from some reasonable Bombay firm—very little in fact—shall hope to return to normal conditions in a week or two or at most a month.

There are some large lamps that lack globes which cannot be procured locally, and we have already had to buy an additional lantern for which we have paid Rs 3. We hope you

will sanction the payment to us of both the amounts mentioned, and also request your *locum tenens* to get from us the list of our modest requirements, renewals and repairs, and order them at his earliest convenience.

There is besides these another little matter, namely the extension of the boundary of our *Zenana* a little to the west so as to enable our girls to move a little more freely and play their badminton without compelling others to sit in the verandah for want of room in the courtyard. But this can await your return and a visit to the 'site'.

Well, I have perhaps exhausted you with all these 'domestic' trifles and made you rather wish I had inflicted a 'sermon' instead. I am sure I have already exhausted myself. But far better than all this censoring and 'universal supplying' would be our liberation. How long will 'the greatest Civil Service' continue to magnify the 'influence' of a poor diabetic and a 'Falstaff of Temperance' at the expense of their liberty ?

By the way, you do not say what exactly is the present situation as regards our claim of Rs 15,000 a year for interest etc. for the last 3 years and for the future, and the increase asked for in our wretched allowances. My wife's return journey has drained away the last drop from our financial chalise even though she and the children and our aged mother had to travel Third and run the gauntlet of the Kumbh Mela at Allahabad. Our recurring illness has at last forced ascetics like us too to give up beef (at half the rate of mutton) to which 'internment economy' had forced us 2¾ years ago. While Hindu-Muslim unity was being preached from a hundred platforms, two of its champions were being forced to eat more beef in these 2¾ years than the whole of their family, servants and all, had eaten in the last 30 years. Who could have greater title to the designation 'His Majesty's Beef-Eaters' than we ? Well, we have at last resolved to eat no more of this riot-breeding flesh; but the meat bill is sure to be more than doubled, and unless our allowances are increased considerably the Civil Jail will take the place of our area of internment. I have refused to have any new clothes made for myself, and even linen has been replaced by kind friends. But the suffragettes aforesaid are still growing and need a sort of moulting of the skin in the matter of clothes every now and then, and

my brother cannot be permitted to indulge in any more asceticism and become a literal sansculotte. But if things don't improve I warn you the gentle half of Chhindwara would soon receive a rude shock when it sees many square yards of bare flesh left uncovered due to meagre subsistence allowance. Even charity would find it difficult to cover, if not a multitude, at least a magnitude of shins. You will have passive resistance with a vengeance.

I shall close this long screed now; but before I make my final exit let me request you to send us the addresses of persons whose letters you have withheld so that we could tell them not to waste postage stamps and stationery on corrupting our immaculate political morals.[2]

2 Corbett replied : "I hope you will be fit enough to come round and discuss with me your 'private and domestic' wants, and I will do what I can to accommodate you. I am sorry to hear that you have been seedy. Anyhow you can be thankful that you don't have to live in a place like Nagpur. I always feel a worm there." Corbett to Mohamed Ali, 22 January 1918, MAP.

30. From Mirza Yaqub Beg
Secretary, *Anjuman-i-Isha'at-i-Islam*

Ahmadiya Buildings
Lahore
22 January 1918

I hope you will be very glad to learn that the English translation and commentary of the Holy Quran, which had been the result of the arduous labours of Hazrat Maulvi Muhammad Ali Saheb for full 8 years past, has just been published in England, in a most chaste and lovely form. The first instalment of the Holy Book has only been received very recently.

1 Maulana Muhammad Ali was president of the Ahmadiya Anjuman Isha'at Islam, Lahore, and editor of *Review of Religions*. He was the author of *The Religion of Islam*, published in 1936, *Muhammad the Prophet*, *Early Caliphate* and the well known English translation of the Quran with a commentary.

It is with the greatest pleasure that I present you with two copies of the holy scripture, which I hope you will be most delighted to possess.

The publication of the scripture in the West is bound to give rise to a great change in favour of Islam, as is evinced from the opinions of various learned men of England received by each mail. Herewith I enclose the opinion of Mr. Leaden, a well known author for your perusal.

I have every hope that this sacred book will be a source of the greatest blessings to you at the present moment, when you can give almost your whole time to it. You can thus enrich your mind with the immense treasures of the Word of God, and you will be blessed not only in this world, but also the next.

Remember me with very best wishes and *Assalamo-Alaikum* to your esteemed mother and other family members.

I conclude with a prayer to the Almighty Allah that He may forgive your shortcomings, and cut short your present troubles. That He may shower his choicest blessings on you and your family in this life and the next.

Best compliments from Hazrat Maulvi Mohd. Ali Sahib.

If possible you might send to me your esteemed review on this translation. It will be a great service which you could render to the Holy Book even under the present circumstances to which I hope government will have no objection.

31. To Vilayat Ali 'Bambooq'

Chhindwara
23 January 1918

So you are coming at last, tho' after so many 'false alarms' I should be justified in doubting it. You *are* a set of indolent, indigent indigestionious vagabonds. I have applied today (23rd January) in the usual course for permission to receive Ghulam Husain, Nawab Ali and Aziz in addition to your own *Jullabi* self. So be sure you come this time and not put the

long deferred visit off once more. It is an age since you fellows came at Lansdowne and even the roadside meeting at the Lucknow station took place a year and a month and a day ago.

I was going to write to you and to Ghulam Husain such long and sweet letters, but the sacred month of *Rabi-ul-Aw'wal* came and we have not yet finished the series of *Milad-i-Shareef mehfils* at which the people here compel me to say something about the life and times and teaching of our Holy Prophet (God's benedictions be on him). Tonight is perhaps the truth. This service is a labour of love and to tell you the truth all the rest seems by comparison so trivial and puerile. More when we meet.

32. To Mirza Yaqub Beg[1]

Chhindwara
24 February 1918

I have to commence this letter with profuse apologies for being so late in acknowledging your most precious gifts on Shaukat's behalf and my own. Need I assure you that you could not have sent to us anything more acceptable than the beautiful copies of the Holy Quran rendered into English by my learned and revered namesake Maulana Muhammad Ali Saheb ? I had read the specimen pages in the "Islamic Review", that welcome reminder of our dear brave Khwaja's[2] mission in Europe, and I was anxiously awaiting the announcement that copies could be had in India or even in England.

1 In forwarding this letter to James B. DuBoulay, Slocock wrote : 'There seems to be no objection to posting it, and if you agree you might have it posted. Mohamed Ali has been a bit groggy lately with fever and is evidently suffering from a severe attack of religion. He has recently been reading Wells' "God the Invisible King" which he says proves that Wells is at heart a Mahomedan'. Slocock to DuBoulay, 2 March 1918, Home Poll. Deposit, June 1918, 40, NAI.

2 Khwaja Kamaluddin edited the *Review of Religions* with Maulana Muhammad Ali. He went to Europe in 1912, the first Ahmadi to go to Europe—in part to carry out family business, but also able to investigate founding a mosque.

When the Indian papers first published the announcement so anxiously and eagerly awaited, I asked Shaukat to write at once to you to send us two copies per V.P.P. He was just about to write to you when on a Friday the two copies so elegantly printed and bound reached us. I took them to the mosque to show them not only to Shaukat who had just preceded me thither but also to other Muslims here, and I can assure you they gave us all a pleasure that nothing could equal. I would have written to thank you for the rich gift that very day but as you had asked me to express my opinion also on this great achievement, I put off even thanking you. However, I have been once more laid up with fever since then, and if I wait till I have read the translation and the notes through, you may have to wait very long. So accept this letter merely by way of apology for the delay in acknowledging the receipt of the two copies, and partly, as an expression of our great gratitude.

Nevertheless, I feel that I must express the opinion formed from an examination of the outward form of the publication, the beautiful printing, the excellent India paper and the sumptuous limp green Morocco binding, and the several exquisite *tughras*, all indicating the love and affection that those who undertook this great task feel for the greatest Book of all ages and climes. I pride myself on being a bit of a connoisseur in these matters as you perhaps know, and of course I have the greatest possible love and affection for the great Book, and so naturally I examined this edition with critical and jealous eyes. You will therefore be glad to know that I am amply satisfied ! This is no empty compliment, but a very jealous man's verdict of the love and affection shown by another for what he himself loves so ardently and dearly. The edition on thicker paper and with stiffer cardboard and leather binding is also extremely good and both were necessary.

As for the contents, I have gone through the Preface and here and there through some introductory notes prefacing the various chapters and foot-notes, and have of course glanced through the sectional headings and the index, and greatly admire the general arrangement. As for the English rendering, I am impressed so far as I have read with the simplicity and precision and the adherence to the text which indicate the

reverence due to God's own Word from a true believer. I am a slow reader of things of such tremendous import and it will take me some time yet to go carefully through the whole Book. But I do not pretend to be a scholar of Arabic or a theologian, and whatever opinion I shall express hereafter will also be the opinion of a layman, and you must accept it for what it is worth. But *the* great thing is that the great task has been accomplished, and there now exists in at least one European language a rendering of the Holy Quran done by a true believer and not by a scoffer, by one who believes every word of the Book to be God's own, every word to be true and full of light, every word consistent with what has gone before and comes after, every word capable of easy interpretation, and not a rendering done by one whose sole object is to present the Holy Book to Europe as a concoction of an ignorant rhapsodist masquerading as a Prophet, and exposing a voluptuary's character and tendencies and an adventurer's opportunism. The difference is apparent on every page, and Europe will not I hope be slow to see it. Believe me Europe will be a changed Europe after this war, and there are already a thousand indications for those who know its ways and inclinations and modes of thought, all significant of the coming great and tremendous disclaimer of its religious ideas and conceptions in the past. Christianity as variously understood by the various so-called "national" Churches obviously did not prevent this aweful cataclysmic war, nor did the Sermon on the Mount even soften the acerbities and harshnesses that cannot ordinarily be altogether eliminated from war. What is more significant, the Church in each Christian belligerent country blessed the banners of the national armies and called upon Christ to assist them in winning the war for their "religious cause". All this makes one pause and think, could all this be Christianity, could any of this be Christ's teaching (on whom be peace)? Could hundreds of millions of educated Europeans remain content with a faith with such varying and apparently uncertain interpretations? Could they continue to spend millions upon millions for Church Establishments that could so little affect the politics of Europe in the direction of Christ's teaching? Could a creed that included among the believers the singers of Hymns of Hate as well as Conscientious Objectors continue to satisfy the conscience of Europe? Well, as I said before, to me there appear a thousand indications

that Christian Europe will take stock of its Churches and its Creeds and its Consciences soon after the war, and the spiritual change that would come over Europe will make the tremendous political changes that seem foreshadowed small and insignificant by comparison. European spiritual thought is already—to use an expression of the old COMRADE—"drifting into port". But if we the Muslims were created for a definite purpose, as we have been told so many times in the Quran that we were, then we shall have to pilot Europe into the safe haven of Islam, where nations with their Churches exist no more than shall the old barbaric tribes with their separate gods, where there shall be neither black nor yellow, but one people serving the One and Only God ; where there shall be neither peerage nor gentry nor labour, but all survivors of one Lord, where there shall be neither monarchy nor aristocracy nor even democracy but an all pervading theocracy, where there shall be neither "tariff wars" nor political spheres of "interest" and of "influence", nor protectorates and dependencies, but God's universal Kingdom, the World-State in which He is Emperor and Pope and Parliament and all, and there shall be eternal peace, that is Islam, the self-surrender of free souls to one divine purpose, His eternal and willing service, sleeping and waking, sitting, standing and lying. Believe me this is no rhapsody of one whose brain has been unhinged by three years of a cruel incarceration in a wilderness. Forcibly freed from a thousand distractions, my mind has been thrown in this solitude on its own resources, and constant contemplation has provided its own compensations. Like a spectator who proverbially sees most of the game, I have watched Europe as well as Asia with the necessary detachment for forming correct views, and without any optimistic bias I clearly foresee that the future is spelt with ISLAM.

Well, this English rendering of the Holy Quran the Gospel of Service of the One and Only Ruler of all Creation, is a preparation for the tremendous change that will come upon the world after this war, and if I live through it I pray to God to accept me as a humble servitor when I may roam about the world sharing with it the inestimable possession of Islam and preach the dedication of our bodies and souls and all we have and are to our Lord and Master. The dear Khwaja is already

among the *sabiqoon-al-awwaloon*, and it will be my great privilege to follow in his footsteps. This great ambition has consumed all other petty ambitions and aspirations, and I only await the opportunity to commence. In a limited way I do not shrink from doing my duty here, and in the holy month of Rabi-ul-Awwal I have for two years been speaking to local audiences on the life and teachings of the Holy Prophet on whom be God's benedictions and peace. But the "fine frenzy" of the wandering preacher—a phrase that fits the true preacher even more than the poet—demands a wider field, though I do not ask for cultured audiences only. and I hope I shall not need the paraphernalia of a "missionary organisation". Islam was spread by those who were impelled by the tumult within rather than supported by a methodical organisation. I do not know whether I shall survive this war ; for my illness has now reduced my vitality to almost the lowest limits and I am now a prey to recurring periods of ill-health which all betoken the approaching end.[3] But whether I survive it or not, He who judges us by the intentions of the heart, whispered in the utmost privacy of the soul, as well as by the deeds accomplished in the sight of the whole world, will no doubt appraise my firm and honest resolve at its true value. May that value suffice to counterbalance at least a day's item of sinning in a far too sinful and wasted life.

Well, I must now take leave of you. If you see Maulvi Muhammad Ali thank him for me as a Muslim who feels proud of his devoted and fruitful labours and shares with him the privilege of at least the most beloved of names in the entire world. If you write to my stalwart Khwaja send him my kisses for his shaggy old beard. My best *salams* to you and also Shaukat's.

P.S. By the way offer a suggestion from me to Maulvi M.A. In the next volume let him also include a short history of the Prophet and of Islam in the early days arranged ***purely from the verses of Quran***, and also a summary of the various ***Qasas as told in the Quran*** and a geographical note.

3. The Civil Surgeon Windross referred to the 'milder complications' of the disease (diabetes) and to Mohamed Ali's complain of 'defective memory, some loss of sexual vitality and unusual fatigue or exertion'. Home Poll. D, June 1918, 40, NAI.

33. To F.S.A. Slocock

Chhindwara
12 March 1918

We apply for permission to proceed to Rampur for a week for the wedding of our nephew Mr. Osman Ali, and, although our experience of the results of such applications is not encouraging, we nevertheless apply to you once more as it is the particular desire of our only sister that we should do so.

Being our only sister she is naturally very dear to us, and she too is very much attached to us, and we can well realise what a disappointment it would be to her as well as to ourselves if we are unable to be present at her son's wedding. Great as this disappointment would have been at any time, it would be felt all the more keenly under the present circumstances, for our sister lost her husband Major Yusuf Ali Khan only a few months before our internment, and she needs the presence of some male relative on this occasion to act for our late brother-in-law and at least welcome the few guests she would like to invite to the marriage ceremony and the *da'wat-i-waleemah*. We have received from her only a couple of days ago a letter urging on us the necessity of our presence and impelling us to apply for permission to Government, and we would have sent you that letter in the original, as it expressed her emotions on this occasion far better than we can do so on her behalf, but unfortunately it has been mislaid, and it may be too late if we postpone this application any longer However, if that letter is found in time we may send it hereafter.

The wedding has been fixed for the 27th instant, and if permission is accorded to us to take part in the ceremony, we desire to start from here on the 22nd or 23rd instant, and to leave Rampur by the 1st of April.

We may add that Mr. Osman Ali has been to us more a son than a mere nephew and had spent his childhood more with us than with his father, and if we are unable to be present at his wedding the disappointment will not be only ours and our only sister's but also of our young nephew to whom we have always stood *in loco parentis* so to speak.

We need hardly add that we would have no objection to such escort as Government may deem it necessary to send with us.

A reply by the 20th instant will be greatly appreciated.

34. From Mirza Yaqub Beg

Lahore
3 April 1918

Allow me to thank you, on my behalf and on behalf of Hazrat Maulvi Muhammad Ali Saheb and other members for your esteemed letter dated the 24th February 1918, and the most befitting remarks regarding the translation of the Holy Quran and the suggestions that you have so kindly made for future.

I hope you will kindly oblige us by your full review later on, and about other suggestions that you may have to make, which will be gratefully received and made use of in the second edition by the author.

I am extremely sorry to learn of your ill-health, and I shall be quite pleased if I could be of any service to you as a medical man. You have our very best wishes, and we all pray to Almighty God to give you a perfect health and opportunities for the service of Islam and the Muslims. We have every hope that the Almighty Allah will give you perfect health and opportunities to fulfil your ambitions for service in the cause of His Religion. In fact Islam is in need of the services of holy spirited people like yourself. We also pray that Government may be able to see its way to give you freedom and liberty as a faithful citizen of His Majesty.

We intend to publish your remarks regarding the Holy Book as soon as we receive the next instalment from England, as the original stock is nearly exhausted. We hope that you

will be amply rewarded by Allah for directing people so frankly to His Book and to the service of His Religion.

Kindly excuse delay in replying to your such an esteemed letter. Kindly give my *Salam-o-Alaikum* with very best regards to Mr. Shaukat Ali and your esteemed mother.

P.S. A copy of your letter together with your kind kisses for Khwaja Sahib's beard will be sent to him.

35. To Raja of Mahmudabad*

Chhindwara
11 May 1918

This letter would probably reach you precisely on the day on which three years ago we were interned by order of the Delhi "Government". From this beginning you may perhaps assume that I am going to commence a piteous wail about our long continued incarceration, and wax tragic over the rigours of "durance vile". If so, you will be disappointed. The loss of our liberty is an old story and I am not going to stale it by further repetition. When you visited us last September you were pleased to remark that I had changed greatly during this internment. But you will find that in one thing apparently I am just the same—the impecunious lover of the good things of this world, in spite of a more than ever ardent desire to improve my account in the next few years of life that are left to a "Chronic diabetec" like myself. This by way of a preface to the usual "begging letter".

I write this to remind you that according to your own admission to Khaliq you owe me heaps of money, and I am now forced to bring a "qurqi' against the Mahmudabad Estate in spite of the "Goanese butler" that sits like a veritable dragon in the path of all such process servers.

*Home Poll. A, Proceedings, June 1918, 359-360, NAI.

You are believed to have pressed upon Hardinge the reasonableness of fixing internment allowances for us when Hailey had thrice refused this. As the Defence of India Act under which we had been deprived of our liberty was to be in force practically only as long as the war lasted, and there was every expectation that the war would be over in 1916, if not earlier, it did not seem to us worthwhile to protest against the meagreness of the amount of the allowances when they came to be fixed at last—except in the case of the deduction of Shaukat's pension, which was a matter of principle and there was no financial stringency just then, as the *Hamdard* was repaying me for past enormous losses at the rate of something like Rs 1,500 a month, over and above my editorial emoluments aggregating about Rs 750. Shaukat too was confident that he would be allowed to conduct his business in the cotton season and make a score of thousand or more on his investment of about a lakh and a half. But Hailey and the *Hamdard* censor willed it otherwise, and the *Hamdard* was, as you are aware, ruthlessly strangled. And Shaukat and I were not allowed to conduct the Cotton Ginning and Pressing Factory with the result that the staff engaged for the season was paid off in the middle of the season and the factory closed on account of the impossibility of our invalid nephew and poor *purdanashin* sister's conducting such a business in our absence in spite of their plucky attempt to "carry on". The upshot of all this was that while we had to pay about Rs 15,000 a year as interest on borrowed capital and rent and royalty and salaries of permanent establishments, the only means of subsistence left to us and our dependents were the "subsistence allowances" fixed for the two of us only under wholly different financial circumstances. The *Hamdard* Press was carried on after the paper suspended publication for another half a year ; but my absence proved to be ruinous to this also and in February 1916 that too was closed and the plant sold. The old *Comrade* Press was closed in November 1915, and, having been established out of the proceeds of debentures, could not be disposed of, and has since then been preserved for dust and rust at the cost of about 600 rupees a year paid as house rent and the salary of a trustworthy clerk who does his best to act as *Chaukidar* and prevent the theft of type and other easily removable parts of the plant.

For the first time now I had to share my poor 250 a month with my wife and the four sturdy suffragettes that are, in Bacon's expressive phrase, my "hostages to fortunes", not to mention mother who has shared our exile from the very first day of our internment in spite of her old age and infirmities and the thought tugging at her heart of our only sister in Rampur, for the first left to her own company and that roo barely half a year after her early widowhood. We tried "a modified form" of asceticism as our contribution to "war economy" and did for long without any new clothes, and consumed oil in place of *ghee* and—may the gods that preside over the fortunes of the Hindu-Muslim *entente* forgive this the most heinous sins—ate enormous quantities of beef in place of mutton in order to live within our allowances. But the thing was impossible, and after eating away a few thousand rupees from the proceeds of the sale of the first bit of our "ancestral acres", applied to Govt. for an increase in our allowances, mentioning that for nearly a year our families too had had to subsist on the allowances fixed for us only when we had other sources of income on which to maintain them. Enquiries were made about my dependants and the domestic establishment I had to maintain here and at Rampur, and the Deputy Commissioner expressed his own opinion also about our needs. Well, we had to wait for months, and at long last my wife and the suffragettes aforesaid—two of whom had now grown up so much so that they needed as much to feed and clothe them as their fairly bulky pater and mater—got an allowance of Rs 50 a month tacked on to my 250, and Shaukat who had been too much disgusted by the deduction of his pension (earned in 17 years of the most meritorious service) out of his meagre allowance to ask for any increase, also got an increase of 50. After a year of exile here my wife and children had gone home to Rampur, and Rs 500 were sanctioned for their journey home and as "separation allowance". But when they were returning here after some months their travelling expenses were refused on the ground that an addition of fifty silver rupees had already been sanctioned ! I wrote at great length explaining that 300 a month for me and a similar amount for Shaukat were absurdly low ; that we had not named any amount in our representation because government knew that Shaukat was in receipt of 600

a month from government itself when he retired a couple of years ago ; and that I was living close enough to the Government of India and they could not by any *stretch of imagination* be presumed to believe that I was living on anything so meagre as 300 a month. I had to mention that even as a student at Oxford I used to run through 600 a month with great ease, and that on my second visit to England I had spent 10,500 in 3½ months. All this bore no fruit and the local administration refused even to forward this representation to the Govt. of India which alone was declared to be competent to deal with the matter.

Shaukat's creditors had to be paid off the interest due, and a big slice of the *Jagir* won by our grandfather for rescuing the English in the Mutiny of 1857 had to be sold during the internment of the grandsons in 1917. Part of the proceeds were reserved for the expenses here, and we have run through about 10,000 rupees in the three years of our internment over and above our allowances. This extra amount comes to less than 150 a month for each of us, so that our expenses have not exceeded 400 to 450 a month for each family. Not exactly a very extravagant amount in these days of war prices. Thanks to friends, we were able to have such luxuries as cigars and fruits from time to time and occasionally even clothes. But now that all our own share of the "ancestral acres" has gone, we do not know whom to turn to. Shaukat pressed time after time the justice and reasonableness of government paying the 15,000 a year that accrues as interest on borrowed capital and other inevitable expenditure of his Factory and my Press, but government has so far refused to solve the problem for us—who is to pay the interest etc. in connection with our concerns while we are deprived by Govt. of the power to earn anything and pay off the interest etc. that is accruing all the time ? It, however, promised to communicate later its orders about the increase of our allowance. We have been asking nothing more than 500 each, for even with oil and beef the expenses of such large household had been 450 and now that my health is worse than ever—diabetes, 4½ sugar in some 200 oz. of urine passed in the 24 hours ; recurring fevers ; chronic cold in the head, coming baldness ; and recurring toothaches ; and finally may I confess it, an alarming shortage of what in these days

is so badly needed, and the subject of ceaseless discussion and comment, "Man-Power"—I say, now that my health is worse than ever, and Shaukat has become thanks to beef and oil, a lump, or rather a mountain of fat and constantly in need of doctor's attention, 500 each will barely suffice with rations of *ghee* and mutton. And then his boys. Zahid was taken away from Aligarh when we could not spare 60 a month for him. He has now appeared at the Entrance Examination and must go to the College next month. Shahid is now 16 and Abid about 12. They too must go to Aligarh this year, which means at the very least 150. And then the eternal question of clothes. My outfit has not cost me more than some 10 rupees in three years for socks at six *annas* a pair, and a pair of thick soled shoes that cost me 6 rupees. But my children and wife need not less than 1,500 a year in these days of cloth famine, and I curse the royal family of Oudh that introduced the bifurcated skirt or *dheela pyjama* which requires no less than 15 to 20 yards of stuff for a single garment. But Oudh ways are hard to leave, and I dare not propose the modest *shalwar* of the Punjab and the immodest *sari* of the rest of India to my wife though the girls can, thank God, stick for one or two years more until I pack them off to the less expansive garments of Delhi. But what of Shaukat? Poor fellow, all his English clothes got far too tight for him, and Zahid managed to take them off in the sheer interest of decency. He had given up all but the green linen *Khuddam-i-Ka'aba* coat and loose *pyjama* two years before his internment. But in sheer self-defence he had to take to English clothes again, and is heavily in debt on that account. And his boys too are grown or growing up, and where a yard sufficed before, three do not suffice now.

So we insist on getting a thousand a month for the two families, although it is plain that my wife does not intend to ask the one and only Paquin of the one and only Paris to dress her in its "creations", "dreams" and "confections", if the increase applied for is sanctioned. In the meantime heaps of bills have to be paid off locally and there are pressing debts to be paid off at home and elsewhere. We have asked the Central Bureau for the Interned for a small loan of Rs 600 to be paid off when we get "back-pay" (we applied for the increase in August and were asked to "wait a little" last

January"). But I must look to *all* my assets, and as I have not received my *Khiraj* for some years now, and since you seem to be in a mood to pay up, as Khaliq assured me with great vehemence, I will now ask you to send me the necessary cheque. I have another debtor in my old master, the Gaekwar who owes me Rs 7000 as my "Gratuity" for 7 years of devoted and diabetes-breeding service, and shall be glad to pay a handsome commission to any debt-collector who would recover any portion of this. However, that is another story, and sufficient is unto you the debt that you have to pay off.

I hope this is as long and well reasoned a begging letter as even you have ever received. But be sure the beggar is the most important that you have ever had to deal with, and will not be denied. With this bit of "criminal intimidation" I shall close this letter.

After this aweful recital of sustained misery I shall not attempt anything more lively or pleasant ; no, not even a message of my ever-green love for the "Goanese butler", nor the expression of my astonishment at the literary—and. if I may add, also physical—sterility of Sajjad. And I need hardly express my sense of esteem and regard for you, need I ? So God be with you !

36. To F.S.A. Slocock

Chhindwara
28 May 1918

We have sent you a wire today requesting you earnestly to obtain the sanction of the Government of India to the increase of our allowances from Rs 600 (including the pension of about Rs 150) to Rs 1,000 per month for the two of us. As you no doubt remember, we had applied for it on the last occasion in August 1917, and last January we were informed that the orders of the Govt. of India will be communicated to us on the subject of this increase a little later. More than four months have already passed, and in the meantime the debts that have been accumulating for over a year have

assumed considerable and very embarrassing proportions. We trust you will remind the Government of India and request them to treat the matter as urgent. Some of our local creditors have to be paid very early in June when they close their business for several months and realise all outstanding debts. It need hardly be said that it is far from pleasant to us to have to trouble the Local Administration on a subject of this sort, but as you can yourself realise easily enough, we fear there is no other alternative. We sincerely hope that orders will be received here for the payment of the increase within a week.

37. F.S.A. Slocock*

Chhindwara
16/18 June 1918

With reference to our representations regarding our financial circumstances and the meagreness of our subsistence allowances which were submitted to the Local Administration as long ago as August 1917, and had to be repeated only too frequently, we received the orders of the Government of India yesterday in their letter No. 1201 dated 10th June 1918, from the Officiating Deputy Secretary, Home Department (Political), to the Chief Commissioner.[1]

These orders are so disappointing both as regards the amount of the increase and the time from which it has been sanctioned that we are compelled to address the Government once more on this subject, unpleasant as it is to us to have to be writing about it with such frequency.

We had invited the attention of Government to the meagreness of our allowances in October 1916, and it was after many reminders that an increase of Rs 50 per mensem

*Home Poll. D, July 1918, 32, NAI.

1 The allowance was enhanced to Rs 450 in the case of Mohamed Ali and Rs 350 in the case of Shaukat Ali. In the case of the latter, the increased allowance included his pension of Rs 150.

was sanctioned from December 1916, for each of us. So astonishingly small and insignificant was this increase that we had to submit a detailed representation immediately on receipt of these orders, explaining our standard of living prior to our internment, our financial requirements during internment and the absence of other sources of income since government refused to intern us in places where we could carry on our respective business concerns. In conclusion, we named the minimum amount that we required, viz., Rs 500 per mensem for each of us, including Mr. Shaukat Ali's pension of Rs 150. The Chief Commissioner, however, declined to forward this representation to the Government of India, although it has always been stated that they alone were competent to deal with this and similar questions.

In August 1917, we applied again for transfer for the Cotton season to Rampur in order to be able to work the Cotton Ginning and Pressing Factory practically closed since our internment, and explained in full detail that the stoppage of our business was costing us fifteen thousand rupees every year in out-of-pocket expenses, not to mention actual working losses and loss of expected profits of business.[2] We claimed these from government for the three years of our internment if in its own interest it could neither set us at liberty nor enable us to carry on our respective concerns, particularly the cotton business, by transferring us to Rampur.

In the course of this correspondence we once more invited pointed attention to the scantiness of our allowances in our letter dated 5th December 1917, and followed it up with a reminder dated 24th December. It was only then that we received a reply from government in which we were informed on the 19th January, 1918, that we could not be transferred to Rampur, that government absolutely refused to pay us the forty-five thousand rupees claimed as our out-of-pocket expenses, characterising them as 'business losses', and that 'the Government of India would communicate later their orders in regard to our maintenance allowance'.

2 In July and August 1915, Shaukat Ali first applied for transfer to Rampur during the Cotton season, but the request was turned down. In August 1917, he repeated his request. "I must request the government to release us from our wholly undeserved internment so that we could continue our businesses (*sic*)', he wrote to the Chief Secretary on 10 August 1917.

We submitted another representation on all these subjects on the 10th February last, and with regard to the transfer to Rampur and the claim of Rs 15,000 per year for out-of-pocket expenses, we were informed on the 1st of May only that the Government of India had nothing to add to what had already been communicated to us on the subject. As regards the allowances even then no reply was vouchsafed, and we had to invite the attention of the Chief Commissioner again to this subject when he visited Chhindwara on that date. Since then a telegram as well as a letter was addressed to you on the 28th May, on the same subject, and we personally spoke to you also in the course of your visit to Chhindwara on the 2nd June.

Under these circumstances it does seem to us to be misuse of language for the Deputy Secretary to the Government of India in the Home Department to write that 'the Govt. of India had recently received certain representations from the brothers Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali, who are interned at Chhindwara, about the insufficiency of the allowances they received'. The representations are in reality as old as October 1916, and the request that Rs 500 be fixed as the allowance of each of us dates from January 1917, at least. Even if it be regarded as only dating back to the 5th December 1917, the representation is far from recent, and we have had to wait for no less than five months for the fulfilment of the promise made in January last that the orders of the Govt. of India would be communicated to us 'later'.

We recall these details in no petulant spirit, but under the stress of great necessity. For in the first place, the amount of increase is still insufficient, and in the second place, it comes into effect only from the date of this order, viz., 10th June, whereas on the Govt's own admission that the allowances hitherto paid were in fact insufficient, the increase should have been sanctioned from the time we began to press this on the notice of the Government.

As regards the amount, we need every month for our household expenses, we have from the very first said that the minimum required is Rs 500 for each of us, though Rs 500 do not represent in June, 1918, the purchasing power that they did in January 1917, when the amount was first mentioned by

us. Government had every reason to believe that the amount fixed for us was ridiculously insufficient for the needs of people in our station in life, and it should not have compelled us to make representations to it on a subject of this sort. But having forced us to do so, it should have taken our word for it that Rs 500 was the minimum each of us needed every month in spite of the most rigid economy. By raising the amount from Rs 250 to Rs 300 after repeated representations, and now, after a year and a half, to Rs 400 after still more frequently repeated representations, it appears to us to be putting a premium on haggling and huckstering. But we are not hagglers and hucksterers whatever else we may or may not be, and the government has had ample reason to be fully convinced of this. Nothing that it can pay to us can be adequate compensation to us for the liberty it has taken away; but having taken that away just to please itself, it should at least have seen that the *detenus* were maintained in the circumstances to which they were accustomed at the time of their internment. What purpose of State it hopes to serve by the irritating and vexatious policy it is following in the matter of these allowances it is beyond us to divine.

However, there is still less excuse for giving effect to the increase from the date of this belated order and not from the date on which it was applied for. Had we not repeatedly informed government that the allowances we were receiving had never proved sufficient even for our much restricted needs during our internment, and that we eked them out by drawing freely on the sale proceeds of the *Jagir* earned by our grandfather during the Mutiny, and from the sale proceeds of other property ? Had it not been brought to the notice of government that in this manner we had spent more than Rs 8,000 of our own by the end of 1917. and that since no other property that we could easily dispose of remained, we had accumulated local and other debts to an embarrassingly large extent in daily expectation of the increase applied for and declared five months ago to be under consideration ? On 10th February last we clearly asked that 'the amount named would be fixed for us and that retrospective effect would be given to the new order'. What has happened is that during the last five months alone we accumulated debts to the extent of more than Rs 2000, and, having failed to receive the arrears

of the increase applied for we wired to friends and relations for loans pending the receipt of government orders. Rs 2000 have been received within the month in response to these urgent request, of which almost every rupee has passed through the hands of the Censor, so that government cannot be in any ignorance about the matter, and Rs 1700 have been received out of this within the last three days alone. All this has to be paid off, and it is for Government to consider whether it is not right and fair and reasonable that it should pay this itself.

Government has already refused to pay our out-of-pocket expenses in connection with our business concerns amounting in the last 3 years to Rs 45000 and as it is very well aware one of our creditors has already filed a suit for the recovery of the capital lent, and another has served a lawyer's notice threatening the same with a view to have his mortgage foreclosed on very valuable property that might be sold by auction in a decree sale and knocked down for a ridiculously small amount. All this clearly spells financial ruin. But to our mind the more serious thing is that the future of our growing children, who cannot be properly educated for want of funds is also being ruined. Surely neither the Defence of India nor public safety demands this.

More than enough had already been written on this subject and that more than once or twice or even thrice. This is the final representation that we desire to submit to government, and since we have been assured that only the Government of India is competent to deal with such matters we trust the Chief Commissioner will kindly forward it to the Government of India with his own recommendation as regards the reasonableness of the request that (1) the amount of the allowance should be Rs 500 per mensem for each of us, and that (2) the increase ordered should take effect at least from the 5th December 1917.

We shall be very grateful to you if you will kindly treat this as *very urgent* and request the Government of India also to do the same. An acknowledgement and an intimation by wire that this representation has been forwarded with the Local Administration's recommendation will be greatly appreciated, as the sons of Mr. Shaukat Ali have to be sent to

Aligarh College at the end of this month on our knowing the result of this representation, and the college demands a sufficiently early notice before admission.[3]

3 In his representation to the Chief Secretary, Shaukat Ali hoped : "I trust this representation will appeal to Government on account of its extreme reasonableness. In conclusion I would only say that howsoever necessary it may be for reasons of State to intern a person and prevent him from carrying on his activities with a full and unfettered freedom, it can never be the interest of the State nor in accordance with justice and equity to ruin him financially. This could never have been the intention of the Legislature when it passed the Defence of India Act.

I trust this representation will be taken into consideration without avoidable delay, as we must commence work at the latest by the 1st of September next. The machinery requires repairs, and I shall await an early decision".

Shaukat Ali to Chief Secretary, 10 August 1917, MAP.

In response to the representation, J. Hullah, officiating Deputy Secretary to the Home Department, informed Slocock on 13 July 1918 that the allowances were recently raised to Rs 800 a month and 'no further increase is necessary'. Home Poll. July 1918, 32, NAI.

38. To F.S.A. Slocock

Chhindwara
28 July 1918

About the middle of May last my friend Dr. Ansari of Delhi, who had just then undergone a very painful and somewhat bungled operation and was being sent by the doctors to 'convalesce' in the hills, wrote to me that he intended to pay me his usual annual visit on his way back from Matheran as soon as he was able to go about with some ease, and I accordingly wrote to Mr. Corbett on the 14th May for the customary sanction. On the 20th of May he wrote back to me, on his return from Pachmari I believe, that he was transferred from Chhindwara to the Secretariat, but that he would refer my request about Dr. Ansari. In the meantime Dr. Ansari did not go to Matheran at all, but proceeded to a place near Simla, and it is only now that he has been able to come down to the plains. That, however, is precisely the

time of his annual visit to me, and having heard that I was far from well, and was losing vitality every day, getting fevers only too often, and, what was worse, enabled to keep my digestion in some sort of order only by fasting on alternate days, he wrote to me the other day that he would be going to Bombay in a few days and would return via Chhindwara to see if he could not set me up again. During my severe illness early this month following on fever of milder nature a week or so earlier I had completely forgotten whether the usual sanction had been received or not, and wrote to the officiating Deputy Commissioner just to make certain that it had been received.

Mr. Pandit's note of the 25th instant, however, amazes me. He writes to say that about a month and a half after my writing to Mr. Corbett the Government of India directed that Dr. and Mrs. Ansari should not be allowed to visit me.

Against this amazing order I have no alternative but to submit my protest, and I would request the local administration to forward this representation to the Government of India.

This, as I have had more than one occasion to submit to the local administration, is a breach of the clearest possible understanding. For, when in February 1916, we were first required to obtain the sanction of the Deputy Commissioner before receiving outside visitors and had requested permission to publish the newly received order "so that they (the outside visitors) may come prepared for the possibility of our request to be allowed to receive them not being accorded to by the Deputy Commissioner of Chhindwara", we were informed by the local administration that "*the object of the order was not to place restrictions on our receiving visits from such persons* but to enable the Deputy Commissioner to keep himself informed as to who our outside visitors are", and that "in the circumstances the Chief Commissioner sees no necessity to forward on the Press notice submitted with our letter" (Italics mine).

And yet here is a very clear restriction placed on my receiving visits, and that a most extraordinary one.

Dr. Ansari is not only one of my most intimate friends, standing on the footing of a relation to the whole of my

family, but has for the last 6 years been my medical adviser also. He has been prescribing for me during my internment also, and since the medicine prescribed for me by Capt. Windross, the Civil Surgeon here, lost its efficacy after some 2 years' beneficial effect, I have had to rely again on Dr. Ansari.

Again Dr. Ansari is not coming here for the first time either. He visited me constantly at Mehrauli in the Delhi Province, and came to me at Lansdowne, in July 1915, when I was under his and Hakim Ajmal Khan Saheb's treatment. He came here, of course, with the sanction of Government, in July 1916 and in July 1917. What has he, or what have I done, that permission is refused for his visit in July 1918 for the first time ?

As for my health, need I say much after your visits to Chhindwara and Mr. Corbett's personal testimony ? Every time that you have been here you have yourself remarked how much I had been pulled down in the interval, and I was assured that the Government of India would be greatly concerned to learn that I was losing vitality so rapidly. Not many months ago Capt. Windross paid me a visit and, informing me that he had been asked to report on my health, examined me. His report could not have been very reassuring, for he told me after analysing my urine quantitatively that I was passing an alarmingly large quantity of sugar. I need only add that both the quantity of urine passed and the percentage of sugar has since increased. The result was the inevitable further loss of vitality. My hair have been falling and at this rate baldness is not far off. To one who has been increasingly susceptible to colds in the head and has to wear a skull cap of varying thickness during part of the day and night even in the greatest heat this means far more than it does to an ordinary man. Then, again, for the first time my teeth have begun to give me trouble, and forbidden the use of sugar or anything sweet on account of diabetes, I have now also, to eschew anything in the least sour on account of my decaying teeth which gave me acute pain a couple of months ago and have to be constantly treated even now. I have already referred to colds in the head which are chronic. But since last November I have been constantly attacked by fever, and every time the weakness that high temperature leaves

behind has been greater than on the last occasion. During the last three months my digestion has been badly impaired even for a diabetic person. Loss of vitality required greater nourishment ; but so bad is my digestion now that since the last attack of fever I have been able to 'carry on' only by fasting on alternate days even after the fasts of the whole month of *Ramazan*. I am so weak now that I am disinclined to undergo the least exertion and feel exhausted after the least work, physical or mental. I have lost weight enormously and now weigh exactly what I weighed 14 years ago in 1904 since when I had added nearly a maund to my weight.

It is under these circumstances that the Government of India have directed that even my medical adviser must not be allowed to visit me. I understand that in some cases detenus have been released when in the last stages of decay, and Government has been increasingly sensitive regarding criticism of its scare for the health and comfort of the interned. And yet in my case it seems to disregard the evidence of the Deputy Commissioner and the Chief Secretary and the medical report of the Civil Surgeon also. This is so unaccountable that I am compelled to submit this protest and hope that the Government of India would be requested by the Chief Commissioner to reconsider their decision in the matter of Dr. Ansari's projected visit.

Dr. Ansari is, as the Government must know, in great demand throughout the country, and naturally his professional fees are exceedingly high, being sometimes more than a thousand rupees a day. With a meagre subsistence allowance such as the Government of India have sanctioned for me in spite of three years of protests, I could not afford to call Dr. Ansari even for a day. And segregated as I am in this backwood of Gondwana served by the slowest and most circuitous railway with the most ill-arranged timings, it means more than a week's journey to Chhindwara from Delhi and back. In spite of this, however, I am exceedingly fortunate in Dr. Ansari's friendship which enables me to get him every year for one or two days. But now even this is to be stopped. I cannot conceive that there could be any reasonable ground for this novel restriction and I trust that it would be cancelled forthwith.

Dr. Ansari is perhaps already on his way, and both he and

I would be greatly inconvenienced if he is unable to visit Chhindwara in the course of this journey and to treat me as well as one of my daughters who after having had the most malignant form of malaria for about 7 months last year, has again been ill a fortnight ago. My mother's declining health which has been to me a matter of greater concern than even my own also needs his assistance. I therefore hope that you will kindly treat the matter as urgent and obtain sanction by wire. Need I say I shall be greatly obliged.[1]

1 Sanction to receive Dr. Ansari and his wife was given.

39. To S.R. Pandit

Chhindwara
18 September 1918

With reference to your letter of this morning[1] informing us that a Committee composed of Mr. B. Lindsay, I.C.S., Judicial Commissioner of Oudh, and Mr. Abdur Rauf, late officiating judge of the Allahabad High Court, has been appointed at Allahabad to examine the case of our internment and report on it to Government, and asking us to let know if we wish to make any representation to the Committee, and, if so, to send it to you as soon as possible, and intimating to us that you have been asked to give us any help we require of you in putting up our case, we would like to have just a few necessary particulars, and trust that you will kindly furnish them to us at your very earliest convenience.

(1) What procedure is the Committee to follow in its examination of our case, i.e., will it be guided by the Criminal Procedure Code and the Evidence Act, or, not, and will counsel be permitted to appear for the defence ?

(2) To which Government is the Committee to report, to the local administration of Delhi that originally interned us, or the local administration of the Central Provinces within

1 S.R. Pandit to the Ali Brothers, 18 September 1918, L 3548, MAP (8).

whose territorial jurisdiction we are at present interned, or the Government of India direct ?

(3) When is the Committee to commence the examination of our case ?

(4) By what date at the latest must our representation be submitted to you ?

(5) When are we to appear in person before the Committee for our defence ?

(6) What are the charges against us, and when will the evidence in support thereof be furnished to us to enable us to rebut it ?

We have always been fully convinced that our internment has in no way been deserved, and feeling sure that it must have been due to some misunderstanding that could easily be cleared up to the satisfaction of all unbiased persons, we have, as the Local Administration is aware, on more than one occasion desired that we should be informed for what offence we have been interned, and that the evidence against us be furnished to us so that we could explain any circumstances that might have prejudiced Government against us. This reasonable request, however, had not been acceded to by a single Local Government that had passed orders interning us within its territorial jurisdiction, although it must have been obvious to them that in the absence of the information we had so repeatedly sought it would be impossible for any one in our position to meet the charges against him and to rebut the evidence supporting these charges. Since the Government has at last been pleased to appoint a Committee to examine our case we have every confidence that the fullest information in its possession would be furnished to us in reply to the last foregoing question.

With regard to the procedure proposed to be adopted by the Committee we would respectfully submit that so far the only reliable method of ascertaining the innocence or guilt of a person that the wisdom and accumulated experience of mankind have discovered is to proceed by way of a public *trial conducted by competent judges, above the suspicion of* bias, in accordance with a set of rules, or well recognised maxims and precedents that have rightly come to be regarded as crystallised commonsense. If in the examination of our

case there is to be any departure from this well-known and time honoured method, then we respectfully submit there can be no reasonable certainty that the result would be substantial justice, and consequently the examination of our case by the Committee can be no substitute for justice done by a competent court of law in the sight of our fellow-countrymen.

There is one other matter to which we would refer, though we do so with the utmost reluctance, and only because it would be impossible for us to do justice to ourselves if we did not explain the situation frankly to the Government. This concerns the *personnel* of the Committee. Without overloading this letter with detail we may state that Mr. Abdur Rauf who is one of the two members of the Committee appointed to examine our case, and as an Indian member has perhaps been nominated by Government more or less out of consideration for the defence, has been openly hostile to us for some years past, so much so that this fact is common knowledge in Upper India. Under the circumstances, we have, we believe, sufficient reason to apprehend that justice may not be done to us by a Committee of which Mr. Abdur Rauf is a member. This we are constrained to say in sheer justice to ourselves and we do so without meaning any disrespect, being fully confident that Government also will readily admit this much. We have with great patience and forbearance put up with the absolutely undeserved loss of some of our most cherished liberties for nearly three and a half years, not to mention the attending worries and discomforts and humiliation, and the well nigh complete financial ruin. If at the end of this long period, which is large enough slice in any man's life, Government desires that our case should be examined, it is only right and just that the process of examination should be designed to result in substantial justice, and that the persons conducting the examination should be such that the accused may have no apprehension that justice may not be done to him. If this is not done, the second state will be no better than the first, and may conceivably be worse. Having said this, however, we desire to express our gratefulness to Government for reopening our case, and to say that we have always courted and still court the most searching enquiry, having nothing to fear and everything to hope.

We are grateful to Government for asking you to give us

all the help we may need in putting up our case. In the course of our conversation, however, we have learnt from you that you are unable to furnish us yourself the particulars that are so unquestionably essential to ascertain before the case can be even understood. We shall therefore request you to wire the gist of this letter to Government, in view of the obvious urgency of the matter, and to forward a copy of it by post.

In the meantime we would request you to permit us to receive visits from such of our friends and legal advisers as we desire to consult in the preparation of our case, and to issue instructions to Mr. Manzoor Ahmad, E.A.C., to whom our correspondence is submitted for censorship, to allow us to communicate freely on this subject with our friends and legal advisers whose assistance we desire to secure.

40. To S.R. Pandit

Chhindwara
24 September 1918

We want permission to receive visits from the following of our friends legal and otherwise and to consult them about our representation to the Committee's enquiry into our case.

1. Mr. M.K. Gandhi, who takes a great interest in our case and has been our best of friends.
2. Hon. Mr. Mazharul Haq, Bar-at-law, Bankipur.
3. Hon. Mr. Syed Raza Ali, B.A., L.L.B.. Vakil, Allahabad.
4. Mr. Zahur Ahmad, Bar-at-Law, Allahabad.
5. Mr. C. Khaliquzzaman, B.A., L.L.B., Vakil, Lucknow.
6. Mr. Moazzam Ali, B.A., (Oxon) Bar-at-law, Moradabad.
7. Mr. A.R. Siddiqi, M.A., L.L.B., Vakil, Lucknow.
8. Mr. A.M. Khwaja, B.A. (Cantab) Bar-at-law, Aligarh.
9. Mr. T.A.K. Sherwani, Bar-at-law Aligarh.
10. Mr. Shuaib Qureshi, M.A., L.L.B., Delhi.

We cannot expect all to come and that is why we have given a few names here. Kindly hurry up the matter and oblige.

P.S. Just received Mr. Manzoor Ahmad's note[1] telling us that all letters to our friends about this case would first be sent to the Chief Secretary. At present we have no desire nor time to discuss our case with friends in long letters when permission is received for their visits. I hope that our letters asking them to come to our help would not be submitted to the Chief Secretary. That would cause needless delay, which we wish to avoid.

1 Manzoor Ahmad to the Ali Brothers, 24 September 1981, L 3555, MAP (8).

41. To S.R. Pandit

Chhindwara
28 September 1918

Thank you for your letter of today's date communicating to us the reply of the Government of India to our representation of the 18th instant.[1] We note the contents and will write later on in reply.

I have already given the list of ten gentlemen for whom we desire your permission. Kindly refer to that letter and ask the Chief Commissioner to kindly give the required permission for their visit.[2]

1 S.R. Pandit informed the Ali Brothers that the government intended to forward the statement of charges through the Chief Commissioner, 'but as no formal trial is intended the evidence cannot be supplied to you'. Pandit to the Ali Brothers, 28 September 1918, L 3555, MAP (8).

2 The Ali Brothers were denied permission to receive T.A.K. Sherwani and M.K. Gandhi. Pandit to the Ali Brothers, 29 September 1918, L 3557, *ibid.*

42. To S.R. Pandit

Chhindwara
30 September 1918

With reference to your letter of the 28th instant, communicating to us the reply of the Government of India to our representation of the 18th, we would like to know what has been decided regarding our humble submission with reference to the inclusion of Mr. Abdur Rauf in the Committee appointed to examine our case.

Since no 'formal trial' is said to be intended, could the Government kindly let us know what exactly is intended and how that result is intended to be achieved, so that the preparation of our defence may be facilitated ? We need hardly say that we have every desire to take the fullest advantage of the opportunity which has at last been offered to us to present our case.

As regards the statement of charges we are promised we trust it would contain clear description of the acts complained of and particulars as to time and place, without which, we need hardly point out it will be difficult to deal relevantly with the charges and meet them.

We also trust that the Committee would invite us to appear before them to facilitate our defence.

With reference to the refusal to permit us to receive a visit from Mr. Gandhi whose assistance and counsel we particularly need at this juncture, we submit that this is neither fair to us nor to that noble friend of India and of her government, and is wholly unintelligible to us.[1] Government is fully aware of the keen interest he has been taking in our case for a long time past, and we understand that he has been frequently in communication with the Government on the subject of our release. Few persons in India command our confidence to the same extent as the Mahatma, and naturally when his efforts to induce Government to terminate our undeserved internment resulted in the appointment of a Committee to examine our

1 Mohamed Ali was informed that the Chief Commissioner had granted 'permission to receive visits from persons mentioned by you except Messrs. Gandhi and Sherwani'.

case we applied immediately for permission to receive a visit from him to enable us to take the fullest advantage of an opportunity to present our case offered to us after three and a half years of incarceration in consultation with our trusted friend and adviser. We regard the refusal to receive a visit from one whose name we had deliberately put at the head of the list that we had been asked to submit as a wholly unmerited hardship; what Mr. Gandhi who has so often been refused permission feels on the subject we need not say, but we feel certain that it would be regarded by the entire public as a slur on one of the noblest men in India which it is bound to take to heart. In conclusion we trust this decision would be reconsidered at the earliest possible moment, and that permission would be accorded.

43. From S. Mohamed Ali[1]

Aligarh
11 October 1918

"Better late than never". I owe you an apology for having kept your letter unanswered so long. Your letter came at a time when I was very busy with getting things ready for the Special Meeting. After the Special Meeting I had such a lot to do that I hardly had a moment to myself. It is only since yesterday that I have had a little leisure to myself. In addition to this work I have had no end of mental anxiety and worry. So you will understand, and like a good fellow, accept my apology for keeping your letter unanswered.

Ever since I have come here it has been my sole object and aim to do everything with only one motive and that is the good of the College. If I know that a thing is for the good of the College, I shall do it irrespective of the fact that it will offend my dearest and best friend. As long as I work honestly

1 Syed Mohamed Ali (1863) was the grandson of Syed Ahmad Khan's elder brother. He was elected a trustee of Aligarh in 1886 and acted as Syed Ahmad Khan's private secretary until his appointment in government service. He was Secretary of Aligarh College from 1918 to 1920.

and with this object in view I have not the least doubt that I shall have the full support of every one without exception no matter what his personal views and opinion might be. I am always ready to support any suggestion or motion if it is for the good of the College whether it comes from you or from Tufail Ahmed.[2] I must give the devil his due. Since I have been here not a word has come from Haji, or Abdullah, or Tufail Ahmed or anybody else with the object of diverting me from the path I have indicated above and you know me too well to think for a moment that I am the last person to be influenced by any one if I do not consider that his suggestion is for the good of the College. I am always ready to support the Hony. Secretary and every body else and everything which tends to the good of the College. As long as I think that I can do some good I shall remain here and sacrifice everything and the moment I feel that I can't do any good I shall retire altogether. You know I am not doing this work with any other motive than the good and love of the College. You also know that I have no ambition for worldly gain or high position.

It grieves me to the most to see money being wasted in every department and if it is God's will that I should remain here for any length of time and keep physically fit I hope to be able to show you what economy can be effected in every department ; but I cannot accomplish all this without the full support and cooperation of the whole body of Trustees and the community.

Hayat[3] is a willing and hard worker and I have great respect for him.

I had no idea that your (Shaukat's) boy was here. As soon as the school reopens I shall send for him and tell him to come to me every Sunday. I have not seen him yet.

2 Maulana Tufail Ahmad was an Old Boy and a trustee of Aligarh College. In December 1918, he wrote a series of articles in the *Aligarh Institute Gazette* criticising the management and the Old Boys Association.

3 H.M. Hayat. See p. 4, 5 f.n.1.

44. From S. R. Pandit

Chhindwara
12 October 1918

With reference to your previous correspondence regarding your case under examination, I am directed to communicate to you the following order and instructions of the Government of India.

The two brothers have misconceived the object and functions of the Committee. It is not intended that a public trial at which counsel will be employed should be held. The Committee will sit in camera and will examine the matter on which the two brothers have been placed under restraint. The Committee will advise on the material before them whether the restrictions imposed are justified and if they find that the original detention was justifiable, they will state whether in view of their conduct since their detention or for any other reasons, they recommend that the brothers should now be released or have the conditions of their detention relaxed. The brothers will not be required to appear before the Committee nor will the intervention of counsel in the proceedings be permitted, though the Committee may, if they think fit, visit the brothers at Chhindwara. The Committee will submit their report direct to the Government of India. It is desirable that any representation which the two brothers wish to make before the Committee should reach the Committee as soon as possible.

With regard to the allegations made by the brothers against Mr. Abdur Rauf being a member of the Committee, the Government of India considers them to be without foundation and do not intend to take any notice of them.

The Government of India has been asked to instruct the Committee to furnish the brothers with a statement of the charges made against them. This statement may be sent to the brothers either direct or through this administration. If it is received through this administration, it will be forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner without delay.

45. To S. R. Pandit

Chhindwar
18 October 191

Will you kindly ascertain for us when we may expect to ge a statement of the charges against us for the purpose o submitting our representation to the Committee appointed tc examine the case of our internment. It was on the 28th o September that you first wrote to us at the instance of th Government of India that a statement of charges would b forwarded to us through the Chief Commissioner, and agair on the 12th October you wrote to inform us that the Govern ment of India had been asked to instruct the Committee tc furnish us with this statement either direct or through the Local Administration. Nothing has been heard since, an three of our legal advisers, including Mr. C.R. Das, have ha to go back after waiting for the statement of charges promised If we could now be given any idea when the statement may b expected we would arrange for the visit of other legal adviser to assist us in the preparation of our representation, for i would be futile to get them over here and then send them back as we may have to do again unless we know with some definiteness when the statement of charges would be furnishe to us.

23 October 191

Memorandum

With reference to our request for an interview with the Chief Commissioner contained in our letter of the 18th Octobe 1918, Mr. Manzoor Ahmad, E.A.C., called on us on the morning of the 23rd and said that the Chief Commissione had sent us his compliments and had expressed great regret that he could not give us the interview we had asked for. Our request was communicated to him only on his arrival here at 6 P.M. on the 21st and he said that he had arrived very late and had motored 84 miles that day. He was leaving ver

early on the following morning, i.e., at 6.30 A.M. and was to have his breakfast at Pachmari. He said he had great sympathy with us and had forwarded every representation of ours to the Government of India with his recommendation. He was no more than a post office and could do nothing himself. But he was very much pleased with our conduct here during internment. This conversation took place in the presence of Mr. Shuaib Qureshi, M.A., L.L.B., Mr. Abdur Rahman, M.A., L.L.B., Mr. Moazzam Ali and Mr. Azim Uddin Khan, among others.

46. Statement of Reasons for the Internment of the Ali Brothers and for its Continuance.*

13 November 1918

For several years before the outbreak of war between Great Britain and Turkey, the Turkish Government had been trying to increase its influence over the Muslim subjects of other powers. Agents of Turkey had by various means established relations with a number of leading Indian Muslims, among whom were Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali, and there was reason to believe that these Indians were being used to further the pan-Islamic policy of Turkey.

2. Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali associated with visitors to India who were suspected of being political emissaries of the Turks.

3. Mohamed Ali published in the *Comrade* and the *Hamdard* articles which were likely to promote sympathy with Turkey, to excite hatred against Christians, to alienate the affections of His Majesty's Muslim subjects and to stir up ill-feeling against foreign powers in alliance with Great Britain.

4. Again in 1913 Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali took

*Home Poll. A. January 1919, 206, NAI. This is a statement of the charges against the Ali Brothers. They were settled and communicated by James DuBoulay to the Committee on 30 October 1918, and to the Ali Brothers on 13 November.

part in the foundation of a society known as the *Anjuman-i-Khuddam-i-Ka'aba.* The ostensible object of this Society was religious and unobjectionable but there was reason to believe that the real object of its promoters was to further the political programme of pan-Islamism. Shaukat Ali was the Secretary of the *Anjuman-i-Khuddam-i-Ka'aba* and its most active organiser.

5. In various other ways Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali used their influence to further the interests of Turkey and, while doing so, deliberately promoted ill-feeling against the British Government and British policy.

6. The statements made above relate to the period before the outbreak of war with Turkey. If Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali had desisted from their anti-British and pro-Turkish activities after the deliberation of war, it probably would not have been necessary to take action against them.

7. But after the outbreak of war with Turkey, Mohamed Ali constantly published in the *Hamdard* articles likely to promote sympathy with the Turks and *inter alia* by the publication of inaccurate account of the strength of the King's enemies and exaggerated reports of their military success, encouraged a belief that Britain and her allies were being defeated.*

9. The conduct of Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali since their internment and the statements which they have made in their interviews with Government officers prove that the Government of India was justified in interning them and in refusing to modify its orders.

*In paragraph eight, Shaukat Ali's association with the *Anjuman-i-Khuddam-i-Ka'aba* was discussed.

47. From M. K. Gandhi*

The Ashram
18 November 1918

It was a perfect delight to receive a letter from you after ages as it were. The letters from you all are evidence of your

*Home Poll. D, December 1918, 3, NAI.

great affection for me for which I am deeply grateful and if as some return for it I could strain the letter of my vow and do what you suggest I should gladly do so. But there is no getting out of the self-imposed restraint. I should be false to God and man and to myself if I disregarded the vow taken after the fullest deliberation and the anticipation of all the consequences that have followed it. All my usefulness will be entirely gone if yielding to so many friends' advice I reconsider my position. I regard this sickness as a time of trial and temptation for me, and what I need is the prayerful support and encouragement of friends. I assure you that within the four corners of the restriction I take every precaution possible in order to preserve the body. Just now a medical friend has appeared on the scene who has undertaken to give me physical strength by massage, ice application and deep breathing. He thinks that in two months' time I shall have put on sufficient flesh and weight to be able to move out and undertake ordinary mental strain. His treatment is rational and natural. What is more I have confidence in it and with proper dietatic changes I do hope that the friend's prophecy will be fulfilled. I have had the charges against you read to me. I had never read a weaker or flimsier indictment and think that your reply will be decisive, straight, and dignified. It is evident to me that the Committee has been appointed to furnish the Government with an escape. Anyway we can now contemplate the findings of the Committee with complete indifference. Your defence is so overwhelmingly strong that if the Committee's finding is hostile an agitation can be raised which will make India resound with indignation over the monstrous injustice under which you have laboured so long and so patiently. I wish I was with you in Chhindwara to assist in drawing up your reply, but that was not to be.

Please give my respects to Amma Saheba. I am pining to meet you all and to meet the children and come in closer touch with you. As I said at the Lucknow meeting, my interest in your release is quite selfish. We have a common goal and I want to utilise your services to the uttermost in order to reach that goal. In proper solution of the Muslim question lies the realisation of Swaraj. However, of this when we meet, as I hope we shall soon do.

48. To B. Lindsay and Syed Abdur Rauf*

27 November 1918

...Most of the reasons for our internment furnished to us now, for the first time—after three and a half years of incarceration, relate to the journalistic and other activities of myself alone with which it would not be proper to identify my brother, who has in no way been responsible for my actions, nor connected with the conduct of the *Comrade* and the *Hamdard*, which were exclusively owned and edited by me. My brother has his own views, political and otherwise, of which he has never cared to make any secret, and he has extensive sympathies for various causes and movements both as a Muslim and an Indian. These have not unoften coincided with mine, and in matters relating to our faith they were bound to do so. Nevertheless, I feel it necessary to place on record that apart from such natural agreement, there has not been any concerted action in political affairs, and I alone must be held responsible for my political views and actions. It may not be out of place to state here that when the orders of internment were received by us, surprise was universally experienced at the simultaneous internment of both of us, although the spheres of our activities were far from identical.[1]

6. Apart from the legality of internments, an enquiry into which is perhaps beyond the province of the committee, we submit that to deprive a person of so cherished a possession as liberty without any judicial process is too grave a matter to be lightly permitted. In justice to himself and to society at large, every member of it, before he is deprived of anything however insignificant, is entitled to a fair and open trial in a court of law presided over by competent and impartial judges above the suspicion of bias, and conducted in accordance with

*This is a written statement filed by Mohamed Ali in response to the 'Statement of Reasons for the internment of the Ali Brothers and its continuance'. Home Poll. A, January 1919, 206, NAI.

1 In the following paragraphs [2—5] the Ali Brothers argued that the enquiry should have preceded rather than followed their internment, that the Defence of India Act was *ultra vires* of the Indian Legislature, and the legislature which enacted the Defence of India Act also acted *ultra vires*.

a set of rules or well recognised maxims and precedents, relating to procedure and admissibility of evidence, which ar based on the collective wisdom and accumulated experience of mankind and have rightly come to be regarded as crystallised commonsense. Whenever there is any departur from this time-honoured method of ascertaining the guilt or innocence of any individual, there can, we submit, be no reasonable certainty that the result of any investigation, no matter who conducts it, will be substantial justice. These are mere truisms, but we submit that they do not suffer by repetition at times of prevailing excitement from which the most responsible administrators cannot hope to be totally immune.

19. As for material losses, Government is in possession o sufficient evidence to show, that, apart from the entire loss of the legitimate profit of business, which should reasonably have amounted to over a lakh of rupees during the period our liabilities on account of interest on borrowed capital and other such unavoidable expenditure alone have increased to the extent of more than half a lakh, only part of which could be cleared during our internment by the sale of our ancestral *jagir*, won by our grandfather for services rendered to th Government during the Mutiny...

22. The statement of reasons for our internment is, as w have explained, vague and extremely general in its nature, and the only thing that can therefore be reasonably required from us is an explanation of such activities of ours as we admit showing their perfect legality and entire compatibility with our temporal allegiance to His Majesty, and a solemn repudiation and denial of such other activities as we cannot, in fairness to ourselves, and with any truth, accept as ours What other alternative is open to us we do not know. Bu even here a great difficulty exists, inasmuch as expressions have been employed in the statement of charges furnished to us which are loose and indefinite to a degree, and it is left t us to supply, as it were, the definition of the offences with which we are charged, as well as to disprove that w committed them. And our difficulty is not lessened by the fac that one of these expressions, "Pan-Islamism", connotes variously, a movement, participation in which is held by th lawyer to involve a subject in a crime against the State, and

a set of duties the neglect of which by a Muslim is held by the divine to involve him in sin against his Creator.

23. Deterred by these difficulties, we could have at first thought declined to avail ourselves of the invitation to submit representations to the committee, particularly as the form of this invitation clearly indicated that representations from us were not deemed by Government to be essential for the purposes of the committee's scrutiny, and it could as well have concluded its investigation entirely *ex parte*. But since judgement could have gone against us in default, and we ourselves eventually blamed for the one-sidedness of the result, we have decided to submit these representations....

26. We are wholly unaware of any efforts of the Turkish Government to increase its influence over the Muslim subjects of other Powers;[2] but I would like to state here...that for more than four centuries every successive Head of the Turkish Government and temporal sovereign of the Ottoman Empire has been, in addition to this, and unlike any other Muslim potentate, the successor of our Holy Prophet and Chief of the Faithful—a unique position for any worldly ruler—he is bound to have and to exercise great spiritual influence over the Muslims of the entire world, whether they be subjects of Turkey or of any other Power. It is therefore not only legitimate for him to try to increase this influence, without prejudicing such lawful obligations as these subjects owe to their rulers—a condition insisted upon both in the Holy Quran and the Traditions of the Prophet...

27. This influence used at one time to be fully recognised by the British Government, and two well-known historical instances, when the British Government sought to avail itself of this influence, readily come to my mind...One of these instances occurred when it was believed that Tipu Sultan of Mysore was about to contract an alliance with Napoleon during the wars of the French Revolution at the close of the 18th century; and the other is the more recent instance of the Mutiny of 1857. In both cases, I believe, the Khalifa responded to the appeal of the British authorities, and urged the

2 This is in response to the charge that the Turkish Government was exerting influence on Indian Muslims in order to promote pan-Islamism and that the Ali Brothers were their allies. See p. 115 above.

Muslims of India to refrain from actions prejudicial to the interests of Great Britain.

29. Accompanying the statement of charges furnished to us is, among others, an extract from the letter of a Constantinople correspondent, with the cross-heading "The Young Turks and Religion", which appeared in the *Comrade* of the 25th July 1911. It contains a somewhat spirited protest, based on the rejoinder of a Turkish daily paper, the *Tasvir-i-Efkiar*, to an editorial note that had appeared in the *Comrade* of the 25th April 1914, bearing the same heading. From a perusal it would be manifest that I had somewhat harshly suggested that "Ottomanisation" and "Patriotism" received disproportionate attention in Turkey at the expense of Islamic fraternity and religious fervour in a country the sovereign of which "millions of Muslims regard as the Khalifa of their Prophet". I had said in that note that :

> the attitude of the Egyptian Nationalist, too, who often talks as if he believed the Pharaohs to be his spiritual as well as ethnic ancestors, and as if he sought inspiration from the Pyramids instead of the Ka'aba and the long line of prophets of the Lord of the Ka'aba including Moses whom one of the Pharaohs had pursued across the Nile with disastrous results, lent color to the suspicion that the Young Turks had exchanged the faith of their ancestors for the culture of Parissian boulevards and the religious fervour that had induced Ayyub of the *Ansar* to bequeath his bones to those who live on the Bosphorus, for his latitudinarianism of Turkish freemasonry. [Indent by editor]

And I had added :

> We wonder whether many Young Turks know that few thoughtful Indian Muslims found half as much consolation in the triumphant re-entry of the Ottoman troops into Adrianople as in the silent prayer that had lasted an hour after the news of this great event had reached the people. The *Irade* for the establishment of the Medina University and the gift of four carpets to Indian mosques has meant far more to Indian Muslims than the purchase of the *Rio de Janeiro* and the payment of the last instalment of *Reshadiyya* (the two ships requisitioned by the British Admiralty on the outbreak of war with Germany, which

> many now admit to have precipitated war with Turkey). These are things which the Young Turks must take to heart and we hope our friends Kamal Omar Bey and Adnan Bey (members of the Ottoman Red Crescent Deputation that went round the world to thank the countries that had remitted contributions to the Red Crescent Fund) who were lately among us, have not forgotten the demands of their shaggy friend 'Hodja Effendi', nor has Khalil Khalid Bey (lately the Ottoman Consul General at Bombay) failed to give the message of Indian Muslims to the Government of a Sovereign whom millions of Muslims regard as the Caliph of their Prophet. [Indent by editor]

A reference to the following passage...would show still clearly that Muslim interest in Turkey is essentially Islamic and not political :

> Had Islam not been a faith shared by them and the Turks alike Indian Muslims would have grieved over the fate of Turkey as they do over the fate of Poland, and would have contributed towards the relief of Turkey's sufferings something like the proportion of their wealth remitted, say, by the English or the French. It is clear that what moved Indian Muslims to assist the Turks was not merely their humanity or the feeling that actuates the Subject Races and Nationalities Conference, but the fact that they and the Turks share the common heritage of Islam. Non-Muslims often refer to the feeling as pan-Islamism, but the Muslims are quite satisfied with the name that their Maker gave it to them. He told them : 'Verily all Muslims are brothers'. [Indent by editor]

31. Incidentally this quotation from the *Comrade* also accounts for my publication of the extract from the Constantinople letter in which the writer attempted, as a rejoinder to our ill-understood note, a spirited justification of the Young Turks' patriotism, and an appreciation of their sacrifices for Islam, and also a vindication of the Egyptian Nationalists' Islamic catholicity, as illustrated by the peroration of their leader's speech.

32. *That agents of Turkey had by various means established relations with a number of leading Indian Muslims.*

We do not know what information the Government has in its possession that leads it to believe in the establishment of relations between agents of Turkey and a number of leading Indian Muslims, nor do we know who these leading Indian Muslims are. But since we have as large an acquaintance among leading Muslims in every province of India as any other Muslim, and are proud to number many of them among our dearest and most intimate friends—and they include men in all walks of life, and of all ranks in society—the fact that we know of no such Muslim as the statement of Government indicates, leads us to believe that the Government must have been greatly misinformed. If the committee could, however, furnish us with the names of some of these Muslims we could say whether we know them or not.

33. *That there was reason to believe that these Indians were being used to further the Pan-Islamic policy of Turkey.*

With reference to the above statement, our difficulty is that, we have no idea what is really connoted here by the expression "Pan-Islamic". If Pan-Islamism connotes treason against His Majesty, or any feeling or action of treasonable nature, or inimical to the best interests of India, or the Empire of which India forms an integral portion, then we must unhesitatingly say, that we know of no leading Muslim of India who has harboured or promoted such feelings, or encouraged or deliberately countenanced such actions. It is indeed obvious that to promote such feelings and participate in such activities is a criminal offence, and makes the person responsible for such promotion or participation liable to severe punishment according to the law of the land. But we know of no case in recent times in which any Muslim has been tried for any such offence, and in view of the acknowledged vigilance and vigour of the various Indian Administrations, we cannot conceive that such offences could have either escaped their notice or been condoned.

34. If, however, Pan-Islamism connotes the promotion of a close fraternity among the Muslims of the world, so that the joy of each of them should be the common joy of all and the sorrow of each their common sorrow ; if it connotes the propagation of a set of ideals and beliefs that constitute the object for which the Last of the Prophets was sent to the

world, and for which the Holy Quran, "the Mother of Books" was revealed to him; if it connotes the proclamation of the Divine Purpose of all creation that runs through every verse of the Quran and every example and precept of our Prophet, that gives to them a coherence strangely missed by some of the most thoughtful non-Muslims, and that vitalizes the existence of Muslims in all countries and climes, and combines them in submission to the Divine Will and Pleasure—a proclamation throughout the habitable globe, from the North Pole to the South and from one end of the Equator to the other, of the Sovereignty of God and the Servitude of Man, and every Muslim's Viceregency of his Creator, then, it is obvious that it is only another and a clumsier name for Islam, and a denial of it is not only a sin, but absolute and utter infidelity.

35. I have no need to pretend that I am unaware of the doubts and suspicions, whether genuine or only outwardly professed, by a school of European writers that have made a scare and a bogey of Pan-Islamism, and at the very outset of my career as a journalist, when I was receiving distinctive marks of official approval from some of the highest British authorities in India, including the then Viceroy, Lord Hardinge, I had felt it to be my duty to set forth in clear and unambiguous language, for the benefit of the Christian officers of His Majesty and our Hindu fellow-countrymen alike, the exact religious position of an Indian Muslim. This I did in so early an issue of the *Comrade* of 25th February 1911, in which I published a leading article entitled "Ordinal Virtues"...

36. In spite of all proper deference to the claims of modesty, I have consoled myself in my present troubles with the reflection that perhaps it was the occasional pungency of such seemingly harsh reference to my Hindu compatriots and their remonstrances against what they regarded as the separatist tendencies of Islam, that I quickened in them the recognition that national good-feeling and amity could be promoted only if the Muslims were invited to join the national movement on terms of equity and self-respect and without asking them to prejudice the essential requirements of their faith. If this is in any degree true, I am amply rewarded by the concord that commenced when so to speak, I lapsed from grace, and has since been consummated during the years of my internment. But was I to regard the incident that I am

now about to relate as symptomatic of a change in the mood of our Government.

44. The charge that we associated with visitors to India who were suspected of being political emissaries of the Turks is framed so vaguely that we scarcely know what we are required to do to meet and disprove it. The name of no political emissaries of Turkey has been mentioned, and it is not even stated who suspected such visitors of being Turkish political emissaries. If, however, the committee would only give us such particulars as have been furnished to it on this head, we shall gladly, and, in fact, with a feeling of relief, let it know whether we ever "associated with" or even met such persons, and state the precise nature and extent of such meeting or "association".

45. Apart from Kamal Omar Bey and Dr. Adnan Bey, the representatives of the Ottoman Red Crescent, who went to every country that had contributed to the Red Crescent Fund, to thank the people on behalf of it, and apart from the natural "association" with successive Turkish Consuls General, in connection with the relief of Turkish war sufferers or the sale of the Ottoman Treasury Bonds, to which I shall refer later, the only Turk that I remember to have met was Samey Bey, the Commissioner of the Arabian Division of Najd, who was accompanied by a young Arab Lieutenant, the A.D.C. to the Governor of Basra. They were travelling back to Turkey, and had to touch India at the ports of Karachi and Bombay. But the voyage from the Persian Gulf had been a bad one, for it was July, and the monsoon must have been in full force, and Samey Bey had proved anything but a good sailor. On reaching Karachi, therefore, he decided to leave the boat and travel across India from Karachi to Bombay, catching a steamer for Europe at the latter port. But he had evidently reckoned without the desert of Sind and the heat of that part of the country and of Northern India. The result was that he was almost totally prostrated by the long and hot and dusty journey and decided to break it at Delhi. On arriving there he put up at the Civil and Military Hotel, and while there, came to learn from the Hotel people that Dr. Ansari, whose Medical Mission had endeared itself to the Turks during its stay in Turkey a year or so previously, was residing in Delhi itself. So far as I can recollect at this distance of time, I

believe he gave a pleasurable shock of surprise to Dr. Ansari one evening by coming to his bungalow in the company of the Hotel guide. There he introduced himself to the doctor and had a little chat, probably in the presence of the guide. Dr. Ansari insisted on the two Turkish officials dining with him that night, but since he desired to give some time to Ansari Begum to be ready with the dinner, he sent Samey Bey back to his hotel and asked him to come back later. Thereafter he telephoned to me to come and dine with him and these guests. That I did, and in the course of the dinner we learnt the strange and fascinating history of this intrepid exile of Hamidian regime who had passed half a lifetime as the late Sultan's prisoner, mostly in the heart of Libya, where he was destined soon after the Revolution to rule as a Governor...

47. In dealing with charges connected with articles published in the *Comrade* and the *Hamdard* I should like to say by way of preface, though it should not have been necessary for me to do so that, besides catering accurate and fresh news for their readers, newspapers all the world over have two main functions to perform. At times they have to act as spokesmen for those whom they represent in the body politic, and at other times they have to rouse and lead public opinion, and bring it round to their own way of thinking. In a country like India where the Nation is not also the State, and racial and religious, social and linguistic differences have interposed themselves between the two, a gaping gulf, representation of the popular views becomes a far more important function in the case of such newspapers as employ as their medium for the communication of their ideas not the ordinary vernacular of the people, but an alien tongue, the language of the governing classes.

48. It was for the latter purpose that in 1911 I founded the *Comrade* at some personal sacrifice, as would be readily testified to by Sir Michael O'Dwyer, the present Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, who had at the time joined his personal pressure, as Agent to the Governor-General in Central India, to that of a ruler of a State included in his charge, in order to induce me to accept the lucrative post of the latter's Minister. I had frankly told both His Highness and His Honour that the particular point of view from which I looked on public affairs was extremely poorly respresented at the time

in the councils of our rulers, and that although the large salary that was being offered to me was a considerable inducement, and the opportunity to assist a young ruler, with all his generous enthusiasms and noble ambitions unshed, in the task of practical administration, on howsoever restricted a scale, appeared at times to appeal to me with greater force than the obviously unpracticable dreams of youth of creating a new earth and a new heaven through an organ of the Press, to me the louder call of duty came from the larger, if also less substantial field of my early dreams. And of course Sir Michael O'Dwyer's suggestion that I could publish the *Comrade* from the capital of a Central Indian State did not appear to me to be at all feasible. For this reason I had taken long leave without pay from the State of His Highness the Gaekwar, where I had already finished my novitiate in practical administration as a Baroda civil servant, lasting through a period of seven years, after a year spent at my home in Rampur State as the chief educational officer. I had bade good-bye to all administrative ambition, though a large amount of confidence in my cause and at least a modest amount of it in myself were my only assets at the time, and the success of my advocacy of that cause was the only dividend to which I look forward.

49. I had received such education as I was equipped with for my task at Aligarh, where I had been fortunate enough to have lived in the Golden Age of the College from 1890 to 1898, under the guidance of an Englishman of great fascination and generous instincts, the late Theodore Beck, and watched over from the clouds, so to speak, by the ever-vigilant presiding genius of the place, the late Syed Ahmad Khan. I had continued this for another four years by migrating, after obtaining the degree of the Allahabad University, to Oxford, not inaptly called "the home of lost causes," where I joined a small but distinguished foundation associated with the names of Wesley, and more recently with those of Mark Pattison and John Morley. Such bias as I had was entirely in favour of the British people, and since I was no studious recluse, but enjoyed participation in the lusty activities of my comrades at my own College and at many others, I had acquired considerable affection for them, which was I believe reciprocated. I may perhaps be permitted to interpose here the observation

that, if it is believed that I am a determined Anglophobe, those who believe this may perhaps profitably spend a little time in cogitating on the circumstances that could have so radically altered such an Anglophile as myself, though I may add that this belief is wholly erroneous.

50. With a firm belief in Islam as the last word in human salvation; an ardent and active sympathy for the entire Muslim fraternity; a keen desire to see the end of communal discord in India, and the commencement of an administration increasingly responsible to the people and supremely sensitive to their needs and responsive to their aspirations; and an abounding confidence in the view that the British connexion was a Dispensation of Providence sent to an afflicted and distraught country for enlarging its views and ambitions, and bringing it within the orbit of modern thought and action, so that it could combine all that was good in the East with the best that the West had to offer. Equipped with these tools and implements, I set out to undertake my journeyman's task.

51. Although I had some ambitions to lead as well as represent my people, I did not feel myself qualified for that more responsible and onerous work, and merely contented myself with undertaking the duty of acting as the spokesman of my people. This it was that induced me to address my appeal in the first instance to the British Nation and the Government, both here and in Great Britain, and I, therefore, selected the alien tongue of the British as the medium for the communication of our ideas...I succeeded in attracting considerable attention among the European officials in India, many of whom became subscribers of the *Comrade*...Financial assistance was offered to me by a few of the most distinguished public men...

53. There was no antagonism to my mind between British interests and Turkish, so that the promotion of sympathy with Turkey was never regardad by me as an offence or in any manner objectionable. Nor was the slightest hint given to me that Government viewed it otherwise. Whatever persecution I had to face—and I have had to face much of it since the middle of 1913—had been prompted by the view taken by a type of British official in India of my activities nearer home, and "personal caprice" rather than "public considerations" of safety and defence have to answer for it. I have had

access to many officials, and some of the highest among them have for considerable periods of time been on appreciably intimate terms with me. I can unhesitatingly declare that none of them ever sounded a note of warning in my ears about my advocacy of Turkey's cause, and although one or two among those to whom I owe my internment appeared to me *after a considerable time* to have altered their erstwhile sympathetic attitude towards the Turks, the cause of this change had little to do with Turkey and the Turks. *Kanpur and not Constantinople was the city round which their displeasure centred* (italicised by editor).

54. But although there was no antagonism between the true interests of Great Britain and Turkey, there was likely enough antagonism between the points of view of the *Comrade* and of newspapers like the *Times* of London—and its prototypes in India ...I desire to point out that the most trenchant bits of apparent "partisanship" that can be found in the *Comrade* have invariably been those in which I have had to traverse still more partisan arguments of the London *Times* and its Indian correspondents or journalistic satellites. Loyalty or disloyalty never entered into the matter at all, for howsoever unevenly matched, we were both suitors for the goodwill of the same hesitating being, the British Nation and State. The *Times* succeeded where I failed, but neither in love nor in politics does the doctrine of *voe victis* means the extermination of the defeated...

55. Apart from the advocacy of certain popular causes, I shall readily admit that I have also attempted to rouse and quicken in favour of the Turks the sympathies of the limited circle of the readers of the *Comrade* and of the much larger circle of the readers of my Urdu daily the *Hamdard*. But sympathy already existed in ample measure throughout India and the rest of the Muslim world, and used to be felt in scarcely lesser degree long before the *Comrade* was founded, and, in fact, long before I was myself born, though more restricted means of communication of the time gave it in those days far less publicity. My only claim to public approbation is that, among others no less deserving of credit I directed the course of this flood of sympathy into channels of fruitfulness and prevented its being wasted in the sands of utter sterility.

56. And I must submit that I am entitled to official approbation also, for I regulated the flow with a full consciousness of the possibilities of danger to a rule mainly alien in race and Christian in religion, instead of permitting it to burst the banks of political tranquillity and inundate the land. Time after time have I proved it...

57. As regards the *Hamdard*, I founded it after more than two years apprenticeship in journalism, and here the object that I constantly kept before my view was that of educating the public rather than obtaining its approbation. Pungency was as far as possible avoided, and it used to be my constant care to instil these ideas of mine into my numerous sub-editors, most of whom were highly educated, but still now at their work. I have the utmost esteem for the manner in which they tried to act on my instructions, and although I willingly and most properly take the fullest responsibility as the chief editor for what the *Hamdard* published, I feel that my sub-editors would resent it if I did not make it clear that most of the leader-writing and sub-editorial selection of "copy" both original and that reproduced from other publications, was actually their independent work, for which each of them would be as ready as I am and have always been, to answer, even if it be to answer, as I have done, with his liberty. They did display a certain tendency to adopt the *Comrade* and the style of its writings as their model. But I checked this act at the very outset, and explained that pleading a cause in the tribunal of an alien voice and Government was very different from public instruction, and that the warmth and fervour of the advocate was out of place in the staid and perhaps dull lectures of the schoolmaster and the pedagogue. This naturally affected the circulation of the *Hamdard*, and I lost large sums over it in its earlier career...Whether in the days when the *Hamdard* was being sold below cost price, or in those when it had come to repay me for earlier losses at the rate of 1,500 a month as net profit, after the payment of my editorial emoluments, the object in view was always public benefit rather than private gain, and no less a person than the Chief Commissioner of Delhi, who first ordered my internment, spoke in terms of discriminating but unstinted praise of the "sobriety" and "moderation" of the *Hamdard*, and particularly of its most informing articles on the war with Germany. I may,

perhaps, also add that one of the most determined supporters of official acts and measures, to whom my very name was anathema at one time, spontaneously wrote to us to congratulate the *Hamdard* on the "revolution" in Urdu journalism that, according to him, it had effected. More than that, not once in all its career did it receive the least warning from any official complaining of its tone or contents, and the committee can satisfy itself by calling upon the officials to disprove it if they feel so inclined. Cuttings from the *Hamdard* seem to have been included in those accompanying the charges merely to justify my internment for fully six months after the outbreak of the war with Turkey and the simultaneous suppression of the *Comrade* by confiscating the security of its Press. Had this not been done, it would have been wholly impossible to justify my internment six months after the suppression of the *Comrade*...

58. Before closing my explanation of this aspect of my journalistic activities, I shall only add that when Italy raided Tripoli and massacred the Arab population of the Oasis, when the Balkan Allies sprang a surprise upon Turkey, and while snatching the Sanjak of Novi Bazar, Albania, Epirus and Macedonia, committed on old men, women and children hateful atrocities, hardly to be surpassed, and from political motives turned Macedonia, in the words of a European and English resident in Turkey, into "an empty egg-shell" the offence of promoting sympathy with Turkey was shared by only too numerous newspapers and statesmen including former Indian Viceroys and Governors and public men of all shades of political views in Great Britain and in countries with the Governments of which she had established an *entente*, not to speak of Anglo-Indian newspapers and Indian Muslims of proved loyalty and great eminence such as Syed Ameer Ali and the Aga Khan.

59. But if I have in my publications promoted sympathy with Turkey, I have promoted it with Morocco and Persia as well, and some of the earliest articles of the *Comrade* deal with the troubles of those countries, which partly preceded those of Turkey and partly co-existed with them......I challenge any one to declare that the vehemence and vigour with which I attacked Russian aggrandisement in Persia and British

subservience in relation to it was one with less than the energy and force exhibited in my advocacy of Turkey's cause.

60. And it was not to Islamic countries alone that my sympathies were confined. The claim of common humanity could not be ignored in spite of the greater urgency at the time of the claims of a common faith. The columns of the *Comrade* bear testimony to my pleading for the "*heathen Chinese*" as forcibly as any other Indian journalist, while I regret to have to say that few of my compatriots spared. as much sympathy as I did for the obscure people on our own North-Eastern Frontier known as the Abors, whose homes were raided by our forces in order to punish them for the murder of two European intruders into their country.

61. I whole-heartedly repudiate the charge that I published in my papers articles which are likely to excite hatred against the Christians. In the first place, the *Comrade*, as I have already explained, sought the suffrages of a Christian Nation, and it would have been sheer imbecility to endeavour to secure success as a suitor for its goodwill by exciting hatred against it and its co-religionists. My publications were never organs of missionary effort. But in the interests of Great Britain herself it was necessary that I should invite the attention of the Nation and the Government to likely consequences of vile and indiscriminate attacks on Islam, on the Holy Quran, on our Holy Prophet (God's benedictions and peace be on him), and on Muslim men and women as a community. Unfortunately some of these attacks were launched by such responsible authorities of the Church as the Bishop of London and the Bishop of Lahore (now Metropolitan of India), and such equally responsible authorities in the State as Sir Harry Johnston, at one time Governor of British Nigeria... I refer in particular to an article of Sir Harry Johnston contributed to *The Nineteenth Century and After* in the course of which he reviled our Holy Prophet as a "bandit-mystic", because no less a person than the Aga Khan, who has so little leisure when in India, found time nevertheless to send me a copy of this periodical marked for my perusal, and to write to me in the evident bitterness of his feelings that such views were typical of Modern European and Christian attitude towards Islam and the Muslims. If this is true then it should surprise

nobody if other writers such as the Indian Missionary, Rev. Thomas Howell, should indulge in still more violent vituperation and in their foul-mouthed manner allege that our Prophet "frequently remained in subjection to Satan and Sorcery," and was "caught in the vapours of Hell," or that supporters of British Missions, such as Dr. Maclean, quoted in the *Pioneer* of Allahabad, should go still further and proceeding from the Prophet of God to God Himself should, call the God of the Muslims "an Oriental tyrant without love or fatherhood".

105. [With reference to the charge] that I constantly published in *Hamdard* articles likely to promote sympathy with the Turks, not one word written to me or any of my sub-editors, or any of our correspondents has been quoted by way of illustration, although war was declared against Turkey early in November 1914, and I was not interned until the middle of May 1915, while the *Hamdard* was not strangled by the Chief Commissioner until the August following. Surely the intervening space of more than 6 months before the charge came to be proved to the satisfaction of that officer was long enough for any one evilly inclined to betray his inner disposition. And since two of the six extracts that are supposed to illustrate the charge were published *after* judgement had been delivered and sentence executed, the person who has selected them had 3 months more from the publications of which he could produce evidence against the accused *after* the execution of the sentence. All the extracts without exception are snippets picked out of the miscellany which the most original paper must reprint from papers. And what is more to the point, most of them are reprints from the *Manchester Guardian*, the *Times* and the *Near East*, all loyal and patriotic English journals permitted to reach India after having been strained through numerous sieves of censorship...

106. But although we took good care to give no opportunity to any one, however determined an enemy of ours he may be...the broad and basic fact remains that to feel sympathy for all Muslims and to promote sympathy with them, whether they be Arab or Ajam, Turk or Tajik, is to every Muslim a religious duty, and to neglect it is, in the expressive words of the Holy Quran, to fall into an abyss of fire. The *Hamdard* had selected as its motto the Quranic injunction

"And hold fast the rope of God, all ye, and part not from each other, and recall the blessing God bestowed upon ye when ye were enemies so that he created affection in your hearts for each other and thereafter ye became through His grace brothers, and ye were on the edge of the abyss of fire, and he rescued ye therefrom. Thus does Allah make manifest His signs unto ye that ye may be guided".

107. [I absolutely deny (the) charge that] I encouraged a belief that Britain and her allies were being defeated, by publication of (a) inaccurate accounts of the strength, and (b) exaggerated reports of the military successes of the King's enemies.*

113. I have now concluded the examination of all the extracts from the *Hamdard* on which my internment purports to have been based, and the resultmust, I feel confident, satisfy the committee that the unoffending *Hamdard* was implicated as a mere after thought, since there was nothing else on which such a justification, as has now been attempted, could be based. But in reality I do not think that my internment had anything to do with Turkey and the Turks, though during the war with Turkey anything savouring of Pan-Islamism was far more likely to go down with the people and the authorities in England than the inconvenience to His Majesty's officers in India, in which was one of the reasons explicitly declared by the Home Member (Sir Reginald Craddock) to have induced the Government to intern four prominent Muslim public men including ourselves. For some of His Majesty's officers, who found me an inconvenient and unaccommodating person in public life, had sought to deport me under Regulation III of 1818 more than once when there was no Defence of India Act and its fascile internments in the interests of "public safety".

114. It is a well-known fact that in the summer of 1913 I had the misfortune to incur the severe displeasure of Sir James Meston, the Lieutenant-Governor of the United Provinces over the Kanpur mosque affair, and I learnt subsequently that about this time Sir James asked for my deportation, basing the recommendation on two letters, one of which purported to

*Mohamed Ali examines the various extracts quoted in the *Comrade* and the *Hamdard* to disprove the charge.

have been addressed to me by some students at the Aligarh College of which I am an Old Boy and Trustee, and the other purporting to be my reply to the first. The contents of these letters were alleged to have indicated some murderous plot or other. I have been informed that these letters were discussed at a meeting of the Executive Council of the Governor General, and that on a reconsideration of the matter by the latter it was discovered that these letters were clumsy forgeries, and the matter was dropped. I think it fair, however, to state that when I was sent for by Sir Charles Cleveland to Simla on the outbreak of war with Germany, and discussed with him Turkey's position and the possibilities of her intervention which both of us desired to prevent, Sir Charles wished to convince me that the officials were not at all hostile to me, and particularly told me that there was no truth in the rumours about Sir James Meston's recommending my deportation. He denied everything categorically, and even told me that he had been authorised by the Council to do so. After this I would have absolutely discredited these reports were it not for the facts which make me hesitate just a little, that they had reached me on just as reliable authority, and I was told by an official of higher rank than the Director of the Central Intelligence Department, that the Council had never authorised him to deny the truth of my information.

115. On yet another occasion was a similar effort made, and that was when the article 'The Choice of the Turks' was published. Deportation was urged by the Home Member, but the Viceroy, supported by some other members of his Government, including the present Lieutenant-Governor of the United Provinces, would not hear of it, and the matter was compromised by leaving it to the law officers of the Crown to see if the Press Act could apply.

118. The only formal interviews that we can recall were those we had with Mr. Irwin, who officiated as the Deputy Commissioner here for a fortnight in 1916, and with Mr. Abdul Majid, Deputy Superintendent of the Criminal Intelligence Department, who called on us on the 7th September 1917, with an offer of release on condition that we signed the undertaking that he had brought. As for informal conversations, mostly when we were invited socially by the

officers of Government, they were only too numerous, and besides those that we had with the various censors of our correspondence, the Joint Magistrate at Lansdowne and an Assistant Superintendent of Police who assisted him, and the various Deputy Commissioners and Extra-Assistant Commissioners here, we particularly, recall those we had with Mr. Douglas Straight, the same Inspector-General of the United Provinces Police, who had met me at Rampur when I was interned there, who also met us at Lansdowne, and with Mr. Fremantle, then Collector of Allahabad, who met us on the platform of the Allahabad Railway Station when we were being transferred to Chhindwara on the 21st November 1915.

119. Mr. Irwin's interview related to the arrangements that were to be made about the censorship of our correspondence; but at the end of it he deviated into a discussion of the prayers I used to offer. Mr. Irwin was new to the work, for he had had nothing to do with us, and we found him somewhat anxious to lay down the law and unpleasantly imperious. This interview led to some correspondence that might have become acrimonious, but terminated in a day or two, and another and a far more judicious-minded officer came as the Deputy Commissioner and it appears that on a reference of the matter to the local administration it was finally settled that prayers such as we offered were unobjectionable and should not be interfered with.

120. The interview with Mr. Abdul Majid proved to be more eventful...We gave the required undertaking, only adding a few words to indicate that we did not admit any guilt in our past conduct and retained our religious liberty as before. Although not a word was said by the Home Memberon the subject of this undertaking and the addition that we had made to the form of words initialled by Sir Charles Cleveland and brought by his subordinate, when he explained the reasons for the Government's refusal to release us in the Imperial Legislative Council on the 26th September 1917, Sir Valentine Chirol has nevertheless stated in a recent issue of the *Quarterly Review* that I "had refused to sign the pledge of good behaviour during the war which would have put an end to my internment." This is perfectly untrue, as would be manifest after a perusal of the simple narrative that our mother sent to the Press and that was reprinted in the Central Bureau's

brochure...[See Appendix 2 below]. But it is not impossible that Mr. Abdul Majid made some report to the Head of his Department which perhaps led to loud and insistent rumours that what had at the eleventh hour prevented our release were two or more letters of a most treasonable character.*

121. In October 1917, I wrote to Sir James DuBoulay, officiating Home Member, repudiating on behalf of both of us most explicitly and emphatically the charge of having written such letters and denying all knowledge of and connection with them.** and learnt that my letter to Sir James DuBoulay was going to be placed before the Executive Council. Since then we have heard nothing more of the matter; but as it seemed from Mrs. Besant's account of her interview with the Viceroy and His Excellency's colleagues,*** that our continued internment rested on the *debacle* of Russia and the consequent military situation, we concluded that all reliance on these forgeries had been given up after our emphatic denial. In this view we are confirmed by the fact that our case is not referred to at all anywhere in the Sedition Report of the Rowlatt Committee, as it must have been if it had been any longer believed that we are fomenting mutiny and rebellion and inviting foreign invasion. In fact, we understand some papers in this connection were submitted to that Committee, and that it found in our favour. At any rate, since no mention is made of any such treasonable correspondence in the statement of charges but reliance has now been placed mostly on extracts from my papers in attempting a justification of our internment, we concluded that Government is fully satisfied that we have perhaps a second time been attacked by a forgerer, though this time only too successfully...****

*The reference to is a letter supposed to have been written by Mohamed Ali to the Amir of Afghanistan and by Shaukat Ali to Maulana Abdul Bari.

**See pp. 69, 71-72.

***See Appendix 2 below.

****In the remaining part of the statement, Mohamed Ali recalls his meetings with different officials and records his impressions of them. 'We have had the most pleasant relation', he observed. 'with all the officers of government who have held charge of the district or station where we had been interned.'

127. I now close this exceedingly lengthy recital of things connected with us and our internment. Had the barest necessary particulars, for which we wrote so repeatedly, been furnished to us, we could have been brief, for relevance would have been assured. As it is in the absence of such light as Government could alone throw upon the matter, we have had to grope in the dark, and, for all we know, may have needlessly wandered far and wide. But in the circumstances it was inevitable. In the brief period of a week all this has been done and old files of newspapers have been ransacked. The mental and physical strain has been painfully great, specially for one whose health has long ago been shattered through incessant public activities, and has not been repaired in spite of enforced idleness, for there has been no rest for the feelings. But release is not claimed nor sought on any such grounds, and however weak the flesh may be, the spirit is still willing to suffer, for faith and belief, for friends and fellow-countrymen, and without unbecoming pride or thick-headed obstinacy it may be said for both of us, and for those near and dear to us, who have suffered as much as ourselves in some measure without precisely understanding why, that nobody is likely to find fault with us on the score that we whined and shrank from paying the penalty of honest and strong convictions. We are God-fearing Muslims and devoted lovers of our country, and in working for our faith and fellow-countrymen we shall never make a secret of our views and opinions to please men in power or escape punishment. There are no doubt many like us and better, far better than us in our country and community. But there is not one too many of such a truly wise and enlightened and benevolent Government to cherish and make use of for making the country prosperous and attaching the people to itself by ties of affection and gratitude and establishing its connexion with them in a manner that force and fear could never achieve.

49. Interview with Lindsay and Rauf*

7 December 1918

1. Our first question to Mohamed Ali related to his attitude with respect to the form of undertaking which was required from him in September 1917 and which he declined to sign except with certain modifications of the language which we read out to him. We asked him to explain the meaning of the qualifications which he desired to have introduced into the language. He explained to us (that)... he wished to guard against any admission of having done wrong in the past. As regards any promise for the future he asked the C.I.D. Officer, Mr. Abdul Majid, to explain the precise scope of the expressions, "enemies of the King Emperor," "friends of the King Emperor" and to indicate what was meant by the words "likely to encourage or assist," "reasonably likely to be construed as an attack," "violent and unconstitutional agitation".

2. Mr. Abdul Majid stated that he had no authority to interpret the language of the undertaking, that he was merely the bearer of a message and could only say that if the undertaking was signed in the form presented, the brothers would be released.

Mohamed Ali thought it necessary in these circumstances to protect himself and his brother against misunderstanding which might arise in future owing to the reading of the *Khutba* at the time of worship...Mohamed Ali then said :

> My creed, practice, and belief is that whether the Khalifa is at war or not with any power it is my religious duty to offer prayers for him and for the arms of Islam. I wish to have it recorded that this is not a mere matter of form or ritual but is of the very essence of my creed. I do not wish to take refuge behind any forms.

3. Mr. Rauf then put the following question :

"If A and B, non-Muslim powers are at war with each

* Home Poll. A, January 1919, 206, NAI. This interview took place on 7 December 1918 at Chhindwara.

other, and if C (i.e., the Khalifa) comes to the assistance of A and for that purpose declares *jehad*, what is the position of the Muslim subjects of the other non-Muslim power B ?

Mohamed Ali replied that this was a purely theological and also a hypothetical question which for the purpose of the present inquiry, he was under no obligation to answer. But he went on to say that "as a public man" he desired that Government should be in possession of the most accurate information on the subject so as to be able to regulate its own conduct and theirs (Muslims) in accordance with the Muslim Law "which is binding on us and in this matter is recognised as binding on Government also".

He said that a theologian like Maulana Abdul Bari or Maulana Mahmudul Hasan or any other "dindar" would be more competent to give a decisive opinion than himself... With this introduction he proceeded to enunciate his view of the law as follows:

> The Khalifa is competent to proclaim *jehad* and no Muslim can question the propriety of such proclamation once he is convinced on legal evidence (*Shahadat-i-Sharia*) that it has been proclaimed. If the Khalifa misuses his power he is answerable to God and his punishment would be greater than ours because he not only goes wrong himself but misleads others. In this world he is answerable to us for if we find that he goes wrong time after time and acts against the Law of Islam we can depose him and take the oath of allegiance 'on the hands' of another Khalifa.

He went on to say that as for the propriety of proclamation of *jehad* in aid of non-Muslims, the religion of the people whom the Khalifa assists is immaterial. He referred to an historical instance of this in the lifetime of the Prophet and further said that the Prophet had a defensive and offensive alliance with the Jews against the people of Mecca. Finally, he said with reference to the particular case put to him by Mr. Rauf, that the Muslim subjects of B could give no assistance against C (i.e., the Khalifa) in such a war whether by word, deed, money or arms or in any way whatsoever. It was for this reason, he explained, that he severely criticised Sir Edward Grey and warned him in order to prevent such a situation arising: he feared a catastrophe of this character.

He mentioned then a passage from the *Hamdard* of the 28th July 1914, containing the words "our prayers are with both provided they fight" and explained that this was written by his sub-editor, Abdul Ghaffar. He was angry with him for writing this as he did not know what the casting of such a stone in a glass-house might produce, and although he recognised that it was only human that Abdul Ghaffar should write in this strain, he warned him saying "You don't know what this may lead to. Germany will do all she can to get the Turks on her side".

He then went on to say that the British Government through sheer stupidity threw Turkey into the arms of Germany. Thereafter when Turkey entered the war he (Mohamed Ali) realised that Muslims in India would be torn between two duties—loyalty to Government on one hand and a desire not to endanger their salvation on the other. (He referred in this connection to the telegram he sent to Turkey). It was, he said, for this reason that he disapproved of war between England and Germany. He went on to say that the tone of the *Hamdard* changed after the 28th July 1914 and mentioned an article which appeared in the issue of the 8th August 1914. He added:

> It was no pleasure to any of us to overload ourselves with duties of such a heavy nature. We should have been glad to escape from the difficult position if we honestly could. The Sultan had not declared *jehad* against the Balkan Allies. I don't know even if *jehad* was declared against Russia at any previous time. I had no means of knowing, not being in the confidence of the Turkish government I was not able to know why they declared *jehad* on this occasion. My only information as to the declaration of *jihad* was derived from British newspapers.

Mohamed Ali then stated that in his opinion Maulana Mahmudul Hasan was one of the Muslim divines most competent to deliver a *fatwa* on this subject Questioned by Mr. Rauf as to the competence of Maulvi Rashid Ahmad Gangohi to give an opinion in this matter, he said he knew nothing about him nor about Maulvi Khalil-ur-Rahman. He added that he did not regard the present *Mohtamim* of Deoband or his assistant as "spiritually minded people" and

said that for himself he did not consider that he (Mohamed Ali) was competent to give a decisive *fatwa*.

4. *Interviews with Mr. Corbett prior to 27th September 1917.*

We questioned Mohamed Ali as to these and asked him if he had told Mr. Corbett that "so long as England and Turkey are enemies, he claims as a matter of religious liberty to side with Turkey".

He replied that he did not believe that he had ever used any such words. He then described his relations with Mr. Corbett and the various occasions on which he had seen him and conversed with him adding that he (Mr. C) was not a person to whom he would communicate opinions on such subjects.

He then read to us a letter from Mr. Corbett, dated 24th September 1917, the letter in which he asked the two brothers to come and call on him and protested that Mr. Corbett's reporting any conversation that passed between them amounted to a breach of confidence.

We next put to him the following passage from Mr. Corbett's report :

"To take concrete instances he holds that the downfall of the Sherif of Mecca and the recovery of Baghdad by the Turks are essential for the welfare of Islam. And his idea of a satisfactory Anglo-Turkish peace would even restore Egypt to Turkey."

Mohamed Ali admitted making these statements saying however that he preferred to say "the chastisement of the Sherif" and "the restoration of Baghdad to the Turks".

Mr. Corbett, he said, was discussing the future and had asked how Turkey and England could be reconciled. *A propos* of peace terms Mohamed Ali at this stage suggested that it would be of advantage to Government to utilize the services of Maulana Abdul Bari, the Raja of Mahmudabad and certain others, including himself and his brother in assisting it in the conduct of negotiations. Reverting to the conversation with Mr. Corbett, he denied using the expression "side with Turkey." He went on to say—"I admit that we cannot fight against Turkey because of the proclamation of *jehad* by the Khalifa. We ask for the restoration of Jerusalem.

This is another concrete instance—and a more important one—than either Baghdad or Egypt."

He explained this latter claim by saying that he objected to the domination of the Jews over Jerusalem who would maltreat both Christians and Muslims. The various sects of Christians were all squabbling over the Holy Sepulchre and a Muslim Government is the only one which can keep control. Jerusalem is the old "*qibla*" of the Muslims.

5. *Turkish Visitors* : In his written statement Mohamed Ali admits having made the acquaintance of Kamal Omar Bey, Adnan Bey, Samey Bey and Mustafa Sadiq. He told us he had nothing to add to his written statement except that he had nothing more than a slight acquaintance with them. They knew Persian only. Kamal Omar, he said, was the brother of Bassim Pasha, President of the Ottoman Red Crescent Society and Adnan Bey was a doctor. He told us he had never been to Constantinople. As to Tewfiq (Taufiq) Bey, he stated that he met him in Bombay at the time when Dr. Ansari's medical mission returned to India. He (Taufiq) thanked Dr. Ansari and the others for their services to Turkey.

Tewfiq told Mohamed Ali in Bombay that he wanted to start a paper in Turkey and that he was in need of money for that purpose. Mohamed Ali told him that he was not in a position to help in that way.

Tewfiq used to contribute to a Constantinople paper called *Savil-ur-Rishad* but he wished to start a religious paper of his own to bind together the whole world of Islam and enlighten Muslims in matters of religion. Tewfiq told him he had sent an article about the Kanpur mosque case to the *Sabil-ur-Rishad*.

When Tewfiq came to Delhi he stayed with Hakim Ajmal Khan. Mohamed Ali says he met Tewfiq there in a casual way. He came to the *Comrade* office with Abul Kalam Azad. He did not again ask for money realising that he (Mohamed Ali) could not help him.

Tewfiq used to act as interpreter for Kamal Omar and Adnan Bey when they went to the mosque; he spoke in Persian. He added that he heard afterwards that Tewfiq, whom he believed to be a native of Baghdad, became a member of the Turkish Parliament for that place.

Hafiz Wahbi : Mohamed Ali says he had no concern with this man who came to India while he (M.A.) was in England in 1913. Shaukat Ali knew him. He was an Egyptian. Mohamed Ali did not care for him and thought he might be a spy. He heard afterwards from Dr. Ansari that the latter had got news from Turkey that Wahbi was a man of bad character.

Mohammed Iqbal Shaidai : Mohamed Ali says he knows this youth who came to him in 1914 when Shaukat Ali was in Bombay and asked to be appointed as a *Shaidai* in the *Anjuman-i-Khuddam-i-Ka'aba.* He (M.A.) was disinclined to appoint him as he was still at his studies and tried to choke him off by saying that the duties were unexciting. He was eventually taken on as a probationer.

Mohamed Ali says he does not know where Iqbal was sent or what work he did. The last he heard of him was that he had been interned. He only met Iqbal on one occasion, viz., when he came to apply for an appointment and then only for a quarter of an hour.

Qazi Abdul Wali : This man was a great friend of Mohamed Ali. He had been employed as a teacher of Persian and Pashtu at the Staff College in Quetta and afterwards took service in Bhopal. Mohamed Ali afterwards met him in Bombay. He (Abdul Wali) went to Turkey at the time of the Tripolitan war—but being delayed in Egypt he arrived in Constantinople when the war was nearly over. Abdul Wali wanted to act as war correspondent for the *Comrade.* Mohamed Ali heard he did go to Tripoli but later on was told that he did not in fact go there and that he had never fought in that war with Enver Pasha.

When Abdul Wali returned to India, Mohamed Ali met him at Delhi. He (M.A.) happened to be going at the time to Lucknow and Aligarh and took Abdul Wali with him.

Afterwards he (M.A.) stayed with Abdul Wali at Peshawar after the Educational Conference at Rawalpindi in December 1914. Mohamed Ali stated that Abul Kalam Azad attended this conference as did also Maulana Ubaidullah. He knew Ubaidullah at Delhi where he ran a school called the *Nazarat-ul-Ma'arif...*

Mohamed Ali then told us he had read about Ubaidullah in the Rowlatt Report and how he had gone to Kabul with one Muhammad Ali who been educated at Cambridge....

He stated that his information was that these two had been called by the Amir to take up work in the Habibia College and that Ubaidullah's mission was to organise the School of Islamic Studies.

7. *The Anjuman-i-Khuddam-i-Ka'aba*: We questioned Mohamed Ali about this society. He told us that there were three principal "holy places of Islam—Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem—all protected by the law of Islam against the approach of non-Muslims".

Minor sacred places are the tombs at Kerbala and Najaf; while Baghdad is also considered sacred by the Sunnis. We asked him if he could define the territorial extent of the holy places and his answer was that the whole of Arabia was to be deemed sacred territory in accordance with the dying injunction of the Prophet who declared that there should be no non-Muslim sovereignty over the "*Jazirat-ul-Arab*", the Island of Arabia. By this he understood the whole area enclosed on three sides by the sea and on the fourth side by the river Tigris. Consequently his view was that there could be no non-Muslim dominion over Arabia which includes Mesopotamia inasmuch as the latter territory lies south of the Tigris.

He was doubtful if the entire country of Palestine was included in the "Island of Arabia".

8. *Affairs in Turkey*: Mohamed Ali admitted his interest in various schemes which were set on foot in Turkey, including the schemes for colonisation, for pushing the sale of Turkish Bonds, and for the University of Medina.

The idea for starting colonies for the refugees from Macedonia originated with Syed Ameer Ali and was taken up by Dr. Ansari and Zafar Ali Khan who were in Turkey at the time and Dr. Ansari suggested that a portion of the Turkish Relief Fund administered by Mohamed Ali might be allotted for this scheme. A committee was constituted and sites were selected close to Alexandretta. One of the proposed colonies was to be started by contributions from the *Comrade* and *Zamindar* Relief Funds.

Later on when Kamal Omar and Adnan Bey came to India, inquiries were made from them regarding the progress of the scheme. They in their turn made inquiries about the funds and were told that all sums received would be sent to Turkey. Meantime the war broke out and nothing more has been heard of the colonisation scheme.

Similarly, he stated that the scheme for the sale of Turkish Bonds originated with Syed Ameer Ali. He explained all he had done for the purpose of pushing the sale of the Bonds and how he had consulted His Excellency the Viceroy in the matter. The first proposal was for the raising of a loan through the Peoples Bank. His Excellency the Viceroy did not express an opinion adverse to the project but subsequently it was given up when it was ascertained that Turkey was issuing Treasury Bonds. Efforts were then made to make these Bonds popular as an investment and the Viceroy never suggested that activity in this direction was opposed to British policy.

He then went on to explain how he tried to combat a project set on foot for the boycott of British goods as a result of the attitude of Great Britain towards Turkey at the time of the Italian and Balkan Wars. To defeat this movement he wanted to enlist the sympathies of the Muslim Native States in India and to induce them to subscribe liberally for the purchase of Bonds. He said he had the support of members of the Government of India and that he was anxious that the Viceroy should issue instructions to Political officers making it clear to the chiefs that there was no political objection to their investing in these bonds.

Eventually Lord Hardinge declared that it would be impolite for him to give any such instructions. The Indian princes would be sure to ask his advice regarding the financial prospects of such investments and he would not be able to say with confidence that their money would be safe.

This declaration killed all chances of selling the Bonds in the Native States and the only result was that several lakhs worth of the Bonds were sold through the various banks in India. Mohamed Ali stated that he made no complaint regarding the Viceroy's attitude and did not want to be misunderstood as having done so. He was unable to conceive why his action

in this matter should be made the foundation of any charge against him and he assured us that far from desiring to create any ill-will between Turkey and Great Britain over this matter he used his best endeavours the other way...

Regarding the Medina University scheme, he said this emanated from the Turkish government. Being at that time engaged in the business of the proposed Muslim and Dacca universities in India he was invited by the Turkish government along with Maulvi Shibli Nomani and Dr. Iqbal, Fellow of the Punjab University, to advise as to the constitution and curriculum of the Medina University. The war. however, broke out and no opinion was ever sent. He believed that Sheikh Abdul Aziz Shawish was appointed Rector of the new university. He had never met Shawish and Shawish had never sent any article to the *Comrade* or *Hamdard.* He could claim no acquaintance with him. He thought that when he went to England in 1913 he wrote to Shawish explaining the nature of his mission and asking him to use his influence with the Turkish Ambassador in London so that he (M.A.) might not be regarded with suspicion as one of the objects of his visit to England was to press for the restoration of Adrianople. Another object was to have a discussion about the Kanpur mosque case.

Returning to the subject of the University, Mohamed Ali said that he announced in the *Comrade* that the foundation of the University was a far more important matter than the payment of the last instalment of the cost of the battleship "Rishadiya" then under construction in England. He welcomed the proposal as an extension of "Islam" (or if we chose to call it "Pan-Islam") the idea being that of religious and spiritual unity at the centres of our faith. Mohamed Ali then said he should be glad to take part in the organisation of such a university if it could become possible in any way. With reference to other schemes in Turkey, he mentioned Zafar Ali Khan's proposal for a Muslim Bank. He (M.A.) had nothing to do with this project, though he was anxious to promote an industrial reapprochement between India and Turkey. It was with this end in view that he interested himself in the Turkish Exhibition at Delhi which was opened by Nawab Viqarul Mulk.

10. Mr. Rauf asked Mohamed Ali if it was the case that when going to England in 1913 he had written to some of the leading Indian papers asking them to refrain from agitation and to change the tone of their criticism. Mohamed Ali replied that he might have done so. He could not remember but very probably he did write to this effect to Zafar Ali Khan whom he knew well and perhaps to Abul Kalam Azad and the editor of the *Muslim Gazette* (Lucknow).

In answer to another question put by Mr. Rauf he admitted having had a short interview at Cairo with the editor of *Al Shaob* in September 1913 when he was on his way to England. He wanted to know from him whether a *fatwa* could be got from *Al Azhar* regarding the question whether the place of ablutions in a mosque could be demolished. The editor remarked that the law was well-known but that there was no hope of *fatwa* from the authorities of *Al Azhar*. The Sheikh was much too afraid of Lord Kitchener to produce a *fatwa* which might be unpalatable. The editor remarked "You can quarrel with Lieutenant-Governors over a mosque. Here if all the mosques were destroyed no one would be allowed to protest."

Mohamed Ali further admitted to Mr. Rauf that he had telegraphed from England to the *Comrade* and *Zamindar* suggesting that efforts should be made both at Ajodhya and Kanpur to induce the Muslims to refrain from cow-killing because the Hindus had displayed much good feeling over the Kanpur mosque case. In answer to another question by Mr. Rauf, Mohamed Ali admitted being present at Aligarh when Dr. Ansari addressed the students there after the return of the Medical Mission. He denied that Dr. Ansari declared that the mission had been a political mission. It was however not merely a medical mission but also an Islamic mission as it had brought Indian Muslims into closer relations with their Muslim brethren.

Mr. Rauf asked Mohamed Ali then regarding certain views he had expressed, in two lectures delivered at Allahabad in 1907. He said :

> We should do everything to advance India in the scale of nations. My view was and is that India as a nation cannot advance if the Muslims are to be regarded as a negligible quantity. I think that Muslims cannot leave their affairs in

the hands of officials saying 'You are our protectors against the Hindus.' It was on these lines I founded the Muslim League. I delivered these lectures in support of the League by way of a presentation of our side of the case in reply to Mr. Gokhale. We objected to his taking up for the Muslims a brief which he had not studied. I still hold the same opinion but politicians, while their strategy remain the same, have to vary their tactics.

Mr. Rauf then asked Mohamed Ali if it was not the fact that the tone of his paper changed after its transfer from Calcutta to Delhi. He refused to admit this and stated that it was the Government which had changed its attitude, not he. He complained of the change saying that Government finding Muslims loyal and contented began to treat them as a negligible quantity, instancing the modification of the Partition of Bengal. He was sick at the way in which Muslims were treated at the Durbar and taxed Sir Charles Bayley with betraying the Muslims of Eastern Bengal. He gave an account of his interviews with Sir Charles Bayley and the late Nawab of Dacca, and also referred in detail to his meeting with Sir Charles Cleveland in London in the autumn of 1913, going over the story of a conspiracy against Lord Hardinge which he narrated in the letter he addressed to him immediately after his internment at Delhi.

11. Having put to Mohamed Ali all the questions we had prepared and taken his answers as recorded above, we asked him if he had anything further to say. He made a lengthy statement of which we took a *verbatim* note which we need not reproduce in detail. It will be sufficient to set out the substance of his observations.

After referring to the articles he had written on Pan-Islamism he said : "If what I have done is Pan-Islamism, am I to be penalised for this ? Are the benefits of British citizenship commensurate with the sure and certain penalties we must risk for our religious opinions ? It is not a question of two or three Muslims. Are Muslims to remain in India or migrate ? Where can we go now ? To Mecca or Medina ? If Mahmudul Hasan has been made a prisoner of war by the Sherif of Mecca what are we to do ?

"This is the most serious question of all for us. There is no charge that I excited people at Kanpur to pelt the police with

stones or that I belonged to a terrorist society. There is only a political and personal question. If I tell the Government it is playing with fire, is my paper to be suppressed for this? What freedom is left for Muslims? This is a purely religious question and has nothing to do with the Turks. It is a question of Islam or infidelity. Apart from being a Muslim I am a citizen of the British Empire. I could not fight against the Khalifa when after the declaration of war he ordered *jehad*. I have read the report on Mesopotamia which shows that Britain was preparing to attack Turkey. Sir Edmund Barrow prepared the scheme on the 26th September 1914 and submitted it to that Secretary of State and early in October, long before Turkey came in, troops sailed from India to Bahrain.

"I was prepared at all times to contribute to the best of my power to the British Imperial cause and the Muslims of India have done so during the war. These are our duties to the Empire.

"What are our rights as citizens? I want to know this. Apart from our duties as Muslims towards the Holy Places, have we not a right to express our views to the Government as regards peace and war? We may be called upon at any time to take up all the consequences of war—loss of life and of wealth.

"If the Germans took India we should for the second time have become a conquered race and we were punished only for our loyalty to Government. Are we to have no voice before the war is declared? No voice when peace terms are to be settled? I make no complaint that Sir S.P. Sinha or the Maharaja of Bikaner should be members of the Peace Conference but are the Muslims such a negligible quantity particularly in a war in which the largest Muslim power was one of the belligerents and the Holy Places of Islam became scenes of bloodshed? In spite of official assurances to the contrary, when is the opportunity to be given to Indian Muslims to express their views on the peace terms and on the future policy of the Empire in its relation to Muslim States?

"I *did* understand the Muslim point of view and there are many others as well qualified as myself to represent Muslims and their religious point of view. One or two like myself are interned. If the Committee holds that our internment and

loss of liberty are justified, the others can only open their lips on the assumption that that would be the last moment they would be able to do so.

"For four years I tried to the best of my power to arrest the progress of Sir Edward Grey towards a permanent cleavage with Turkey and other Muslim states such as Persia and Morocco. My efforts were of no avail in India and much less at the Foreign Office and the result was this war. The war came and is now practically ended. If any one tried today to sound a note of warning he would be called a 'kill-joy.'

"In our own case it may be that this very statement of mine may be regarded as sufficient justification for our internment but I am prepared to go to jail for years if it is only on these terms I can warn the Government. This war will not be the last of the wars if no respect is paid to Muslim law and Muslim sentiment in the settlement of peace and what is more important, in the chalking out of our Imperial path for our further progress."

...After alluding to the grounds set out for his internment Mohamed Ali proceeded :

> "Are these to be grounds for internment in future ? I feel it my duty to warn the Government that there will be a serious war in future in which every Muslim will hold it to be a religious duty to fight against people who concede them nothing and yet demand every sacrifice from them in the cause of Empire. The next war will be a sea of blood. I speak with knowledge of past history and can testify to the powers of the Muslims. If a truly Muslim control over the Holy Places of Islam is not assured and if any outside interference, open or disguised, takes place regarding the question of the Khilafat I foresee nothing but disaster even if the Muslims are entirely crushed and exterminated at the end of it......As things are moving even a hardened sinner like myself is likely to be converted to the popular view that these are signs of the approach of the day of doom. I hold out no threats to government ; I am not addressing a popular assembly to foment excitement. The Government it powerful enough to intern me for 3½ years and also to hang me but a great world movement such as a political blunder today may presage cannot be stopped by getting

rid of one or two men; and in fact such displays of power may precipitate the disaster.

Modesty or lack of modesty—these are irrelevant in such huge issues. Even at the risk of appearing self-important and passing as adviser-extraordinary to the Government or of playing at mock heroics, I would beseech Government to consider the whole situation of the British Empire in its relation to Islam and to avoid the recurrence of a war such as this with any portion of the Muslim world engaged on the opposite side. Apart from performing our duty as Muslims we claim the right of self-determination since we are told that it is for this principle the war was waged and the world is to be made safe for democracy. It will be a peculiar kind of self-determination if Mr. Balfour and Mr. Lloyd George between them are assisted by Colonial ministers and even by my friend Sir S.P. Sinha and the Maharaja of Bikaner to determine issues of war for future as well as the past without the least consultation with the representatives of 70 million Muslims in India let alone 30 million others included in the British Empire. It will be a peculiar kind of democracy if the world is not to be made safe for a creed that has 300 million adherents."

Mohamed Ali then said that he had made no plans for the future but supposed he would have to resume the career of a journalist which he had taken up in spite of tempting offers of Government service including the post of Assistant Director of Criminal Intelligence. But if his papers were to be treated as the *Comrade* and *Hamdard* had been, it would be a more profitable investment for him to throw a lakh of rupees into the gutter. Neither financially nor politically could reversion to the work of a journalist be considered safe if the present conditions remain. My article on the "Choice of the Turks" was being praised even by the *Morning Post* on the very day my security was being forfeited in India. I am charged on the strength of a few scraffy extracts from my papers. This is a warning to journalists. I tell them all to shut up shop. Freedom of conscience, freedom of the press, neither has any reality. We rely upon broken reeds if we rely upon these hereafter.

"I feel that I have now said everything I had to say."

50. Report submitted by B. Lindsay and A. Rauf on the cases of Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali*

Allahabad
11 December 1918

ANJUMAN-I-KHUDDAM-I-KA'ABA

4. ...It is stated that both of them (the Ali Brothers) took part in the foundation of the Society (*Anjuman-i-Khuddam-i-Ka'aba*) and that Shaukat Ali was the Secretary of the *Anjuman* and its most active organiser. It is further stated that although the ostensible object of the Society was religious, there was reason to believe that the real object of its promoters was to further the political programme of pan-Islamism.

5. ...It appears that the intention to establish the *Anjuman* was publicly announced for the first time on the 31st March 1913 in a speech made by Shaukat Ali at Amritsar in which he declared the duty of all Muslims to unite for the purpose of protecting the Holy Places of Islam against non-Muslim aggression. Prior to this, however, the project seems to have been discussed at Lucknow by Mushir Husain Kidwai[1] and Maulvi Abdul Bari.

After an outline of the scheme had been published in April 1913 in a letter addressed by Mushir Husain to the *Al-Hilal* newspaper, a meeting was held at Lucknow at which the

*This Report was submitted by the committee which was appointed to enquire into the cases of the Ali Brothers. The charges were sent to them on 13 November 1918 and their written replies were received on 2 December 1918. On 6-7 December Lindsay and Rauf interviewed the Ali Brothers in Chhindwara. These details are set out in Part I of the Report, while Part II refers to Mohamed Ali's objection that the Defence of India Act, 1915, was *ultra vires* of the Indian Legislature, and that if the Act was *intra vires*, 'the rules made under it...were made without authority'. Part III of the Report produced here in an abridged form deals with the history of the *Anjuman-i-Khuddam-i-Ka'aba*. Persian, Urdu and Arabic words are italicised by the editor. The indent is also that of the editor.

1 Mushir Husain Kidwai (b. 1878) belonged to a petty zamindar family of Gadia in Barabanki district; one of the founders of the *Anjuman-i-Khuddam-i-Kaaba*; President, Oudh Khilafat Conference, May 1920; joined the Swarajists, 1923; President of the socialist group of the legislative assembly members formed in March 1924.

society was inaugurated. A committee was appointed which included Abdul Bari, Mushir Husain, Mohamed Ali and a set of provisional rules were drawn up and widely published.[2]

At a later stage the rules of the society were amended probably with the intention of rendering the scheme more popular; in particular, it was thought advisable to alter the form of the oath of membership to which some objection appears to have been raised. The constitution of the *Anjuman* was finally settled about the beginning of 1914 and a complete statement of the rules as amended was published this time.

The whole administration of the *Anjuman* was committed to the control of a central committee with headquarters at Delhi, which included in addition to those already mentioned, Dr. Mukhtar Ahmad Ansari of Delhi.[3]

6. Notwithstanding the declaration...that the society was purely religious and had "no connection whatever with political affairs", it is apparent from the report of the proceedings of the central committee on the 15th February 1914 that doubts had been raised regarding the correctness of this description of the society's aims and there was some discussion as to the legality of contributing financial assistance to another 'kingdom' for the purpose of a religious duty.

The report shows that Mohamed Ali expressed the opinion that the rendering of such assistance '*in time of peace*' was not forbidden by international law, and ultimately a resolution was passed directing 'that the *Anjuman* should lay its aims and objects and other necessary papers before the Government in a proper manner and that it should also be stated in a proper manner that if the Government, having regard to the aims and objects of the *Anjuman*, wants to give any advice the *Anjuman* is always ready to consider it'.

After this correspondence took place between Abdul Bari and the Private Secretary to the Viceroy it appears that Abdul Bari sought to draw His Excellency into expressing an opinion regarding the character of the society and that His Excellency

2 The aims and objects of the society were expounded in an article published in the *Comrade* of 31 May and 7 June 1913.

3 For list of the founding members, see Abdul Bari Papers (1/42). Firangi Mahal, Lucknow.

preferred to abstain from 'the expression of any opinion about a society which claims a purely religious character'.[4]

7. With a view to ascertaining the real purpose of the *Anjuman* we shall refer in the first place to what may be called internal evidence consisting (1) of the statement of the aims of the society contained in its memorandum of association, and (2) of declarations made by persons who were prominent members of the organisation.

In the preamble to the final draft of the Rules (*Dastur-ul-Amal*) it is stated that 'recent viccissitudes have demonstrated the necessity for all Muslims to take a practical share in the protection of the Holy Places'.

Paragraph five of the rules, which prescribes the form of oath to be taken by members, requires all who join to render all possible assistance in protecting the *Harmain-i-Sharifain* at the time of non-Muslim invasion.

Paragraph twenty-nine lays down the rate of subscription and paragraph thirty relates to the application of the funds raised by the society. It provides that one-half of the income is to be made over to

> that *independent* Muslim power which may protect the Holy Places, but on the condition that it shall spend the money in such works as relate to the preservation of their sanctity and glory and the liberty of that holy land.

Paragraph twenty-one of the rules for *Shaidais* (votaries) lays down that one-half of the total income of the *Anjuman* is to be remitted by the Central Committee to the *Khadim-i-Harmain-i-Sharifain*...The *Khadim-i-Harmain-i-Sharifain* is, of course, the Sultan of Turkey. It seems clear, therefore, that the constitution of the society provides for the supply of funds to an 'independent Muslim power', and although it is declared that the money is to be applied only for the preservation of the sanctity of the Holy Places, it is not explained how much a condition could be enforced against a power which is 'independent'.

8. We may now turn to examine the exposition of the aims and objects of the society contained in the articles

4 For the exchange of correspondence between Abdul Bari and the Viceroy on the aims and objects of the *Anjuman*, see Home Poll. Deposit, April 1915, 19, NAI.

published in the *Comrade* on the 31st May and 7th June 1913 : We...presume that the statements quoted are those of Mohamed Ali himself. The subject is introduced with a charge against Mr. Asquith of having gone back upon the agreement of England to maintain the *status quo* in the Balkans and to secure the integrity of the Ottoman Empire. It is argued that there is no prospect of security for Turkey even if she is thrust into Asia where Russia and France are already intriguing and that the future of Turkey is no less dark and gloomy than her recent past. Then we have a reference to the tragedy of Turkey in Europe, the strangling of Persia and loss to Islam of the independent kingdoms in Africa, and an exhortation to the Muslims of the world to no longer remain indifferent to the fate of their Holy Places :

> If those Muslims who have hitherto formed part of the ruling races of mankind cannot safeguard the *effective sovereignty* of some Muslim State over the Holy Places of Islam, the hundreds of millions of Muslims who are numbered among the *subject races* must now make up their minds to do so.

The writer then proceeds to enumerate the work to be undertaken by the members of the society '*apart* from the work of safeguarding the sanctity of the *Ka'aba* and other sacred places of Islam from violation and *maintaining an independent and effective Muslim sovereignty over these lands*'.

Following upon this declaration we have to protest that the society is in its essence a purely religious organisation, the reason given being that the duty of pilgrimage is incumbent on every Muslim. It is pointed out that since the time Prophet occupied Mecca, none but a Muslim ruler has been recognised there and that for thirteen centuries no non-Muslim has been permitted to enter the *Ka'aba* or its precincts...

The article concludes with a direct appeal to the Muslims of India who are reminded that Turkey, which has stood for centuries as a sentinel at the gate of the *Ka'aba* is now weaker than ever and they are exhorted to organise themselves so as to be able to meet with their own weapons...[5]

5 This is followed by an account of Shaukat Ali's views.

10. We proceed next to consider the view of the objects of the society entertained by one of its founders, Mushir Husain Kidwai, and in this connection we refer to a letter addressed by him to the *Al-Hilal* newspaper [13-20 May 1914]. Mushir Husain was at that time in London where a branch of the *Anjuman* was started in the summer of 1914. In his letter to *Al-Hilal* Mushir Husain attacks Shaukat Ali for having, as a Secretary of the *Anjuman-i-Khuddam-i-Ka'aba*, signed an address presented to the Viceroy, an act which he appears to regard as inconsistent with the principles of the *Anjuman*.

His creed apparently is that the members of the *Anjuman* have no concern with the pleasure of any worldly ruler and are not subject to any obligation of loyalty. "They cannot put their signatures to any document which purports to mean their unconditional loyalty" because it is possible that their oath of service to the sacred places may compel them to be otherwise.[6]

He goes on to declare that the members have no concern with the question whether subjects of one government can render financial aid to another government and while he thinks that neither the English law nor International Law can prevent the *Anjuman* from giving money to the Turks for the purpose of protecting the *Ka'aba* he is of opinion that even if they did the prohibition should be disregarded...

We conclude, therefore, that Mushir Husain's view is that members of the *Anjuman-i-Khuddam-i-Ka'aba* are clear of any obligation compelling them to temporal allegiance and may, for the purpose of protecting the Holy Places of Islam, defy the laws of the country in which they happen to be settled.[7]

12. Passing on now to what we may describe as the external evidence relevant to the question under discussion we may refer in the first place to various reports regarding pan-Islamic activity in Constantinople and Egypt during a period of several years prior to the establishment of the *Khuddam-i-Ka'aba* society in India....

6 Mushir Husain was Honorary Secretary of the London branch and among the members of the managing committee was Zafar Ali Khan, editor of the *Zamindar*.

7 This is followed by the report of an interview between Abdul Bari and a 'prominent supporter' of the *Anjuman* in Bombay.

13. We have (also) some independent evidence indicating the influence which was being exerted on Indian visitors to Turkey as far back as the year 1906 when one Sheikh Abdul Qadir and Mushir Husain Kidwai paid a visit to Constantinople. The latter on this occasion was the recipient of an order from the Sultan. The former kept a diary during his stay which was afterwards published in the *Observer* newspaper (Lahore). Abdul Qadir declared that the Khedive was devoted to the Sultan and would do anything for him if only the British would allow him. He stated that Turkey was setting her house in order and would try with the help of the Egyptians to oust the British form Egypt. He added that it was necessary that there should be relations between India and Turkey, but that they would have to be effected with great care and secrecy.

14. In 1910 Mushir Husain visited Turkey again when he described himself as the "Indian delegate of the Committee of Subscription for the Ottoman Navy"...Mushir Husain in an "open letter" to the *Sirat-i-Mustaqim* aired his views regarding the new conditions in Turkey and a perusal of the letter indicates clearly that his purpose was to remove a suspicion which had gathered round the new party, a suspicion that they were no longer sincere adherents of Islam. He speaks of the apprehension of Indian Muslims that the Khilafat might be divorced from the Government and declares that Turkey is respected because the sovereign is the Khalifa of the Muslims and the guardian of the holy cities of Mecca and Medina. He then goes on to assure his readers that their apprehensions regarding the character of the new party—apprehensions which he had shared himself—were without foundation. The revolution is to fully appreciate the fact that there must be no weakening of 'the seat of the Khilafat'...

15. He concludes by exhorting all Muslims "to turn to the Khalifa with such ardour that it may become impossible for any earthly power, Muslim or not, to bring about any injury to the Khilafat".

16. We come now to an event of peculiar importance,

8 Also, see P.C. Bamford, *Histories of the Khilafat and Non-cooperation Movements* (Delhi, 1975 Reprint), p. 113.

namely, the medical mission to Turkey which was organised by Dr. Ansari at the end of 1912.[8]

While it need not be doubted that the mission rendered valuable services to the Turkish wounded, it is manifest that the members of it took a lively interest in the political affairs of Turkey so much so that a number of them remained behind after the close of hostilities and busied themselves with various schemes of a more or less political character. One of the earliest letters written by Dr. Ansari is devoted to a jubilant description of the *coup d'etat* engineered by Enver Bey.[9] He refers pointedly to the triumph of the Young Turk party which has saved the prestige of Turkey, to the open assurances of help given to Turkey by the Triple Alliance and to a large financial contribution promised by the Deutsche Orient Bank.

In another letter he refers to a meeting with Enver Bey,[10] to the appointment of Dr. Ahmad Fuad as interpreter to the mission and to an interview with Shawish for whom he expresses unbounded admiration.[11] In this letter he also mentions one Mohammad Mazhar as having joined the mission as a volunteer. This is the man who subsequently attempted to assassinate the ex-Khedive.

A third letter of Ansari after decrying the efforts of the British Red Crescent Mission speaks of the favour he had won with the Committee of Union and Progress and contains the first suggestion for the sale of Turkish bonds in India. The

9 Enver Bey (Pasha); 1881-1922: Turkish soldier and leader of the Young Turks; raised revolt in Macedonia (1908) forcing Sultan Abdul Hamid to restore the constitution of 1876. During the negotiations after the Balkan War (1913), he led a group which assassinated the Minister of War, turned out of office the Grand Vizier and forced the Sultan to fill governmental offices with Young Turk leaders.

10 Ansari described him as 'a young man of about 35, exceedingly handsome, with most expressive eyes full of determination (and) with a demeanour of a very strong man, chastened with hardships and sufferings'. *Comrade*, 15 February 1913.

11 Shaikh Abdul Aziz Shawish, described by Ansari as 'a very impressive man who chooses every word before uttering it'. *Comrade*, 8 February 1913.

scheme for this seems to have originated in a discussion between Ansari and Talat Bey.[12]

Further proposals in the direction of pushing these bonds in India were published in a letter received from Abdur Rahman Sindhi, who stated that he had been in consultation with Talat and Sheikh Shawish about the scheme.

Another member of the mission who interested himself in the project of the Bonds was one Dr. Shamsul Bari, who it appears, was turned away on account of his disreputable character. On his way back to India he stayed awhile in Egypt where he delivered himself of strong anti-British sentiments and spoke of the scheme for raising three million pounds by the sale of the bonds. This man, after his return to India, came to Banaras, where he made an appeal for money for Turkey.

Later letters published in the *Comrade* referred to a scheme for a news agency by which correct news of the war was to be conveyed to India. Arrangements for this were made by Talat Bey.

One of them mentions the name of Syed Ahmad Shah Jilani as a helper of the mission. This man was later on arrested in Egypt for attempts to corrupt the Indian troops who had been sent there.

We also get news of the arrival of Zafar Ali Khan at Constantinople and of his entertainment by Izzat Pasha,[13] and another letter, which informs the editor of the *Comrade* that his labours are about to bear 'great fruit', announces the intention of the Turks *to send a mission to India, the object being to establish closer relations with the Indian Muslims.*

After this there is an announcement of the proposed scheme for settling refugees in Anatolia which is "to sow seed of greater things". This scheme was boomed by Zafar Ali, and Mohamed Ali was also appointed one of the directors, the

12 Talat Bey (Pasha) 1872-1921 : leader of the Young Turks who, after the Turkish revolution (1908) held several ministerial positions ; succeeded as grand vizier of Turkey (February 1917) but was forced into retirement in October 1918.

13 (b. 1870) : Turkish general and statesman of Albanian descent ; chief of general staff (1908), and commander-in-chief during Balkan War (1943) ; during World War led army of the Caucasus.

proposal being to have two colonies named after the papers edited by these two men.[13a]

Another scheme evolved from the brain of Zafar Ali Khan was that of a Muslim Cooperative Bank. The committee appointed in connection with this project included Zafar Ali Ansari, and Sheikh Shawish and, lastly, we may refer to the Medina University Scheme.

Mohamed Ali was invited to prepare a constitution for the University and we have it that Shawish got himself appointed Rector and actually laid the foundation stone. The idea was, of course, to attract young Muslims to Medina from all parts of the Islamic world and to provide them there with appropriate instruction. Most of the members of the medical mission, including Ansari, returned to India in the beginning of July 1913 and were accorded a great reception.[14] Pro-Turkish speeches were delivered, the most notable of which was one by Ansari at the Juma Masjid in Delhi on the 11th July. In this he described the struggle of Turkey against all the powers and after dwelling upon the Christian atrocities committed during the war (including as he said, the deliberate demolition of mosques), he called upon his audience "not to forget these things in dealing with Christians who are bent upon wiping Islam from the face of the earth".

We may mention at this stage that one of the members of Dr. Ansari's medical mission, who remained in Turkey, was Mirza Abdul Qayum. He took part in some colonisation work, was later employed in a Turkish cap manufactory and was ultimately killed in Mesopotamia, fighting for the Turks. The news of his death was published in a Dutch newspaper, the report being taken from a German paper published in Constantinople in which he was described as the leader of the Indian Volunteer Corps.

Another member, who stayed behind but returned to India somewhat later, was Abdur Rahman Siddiqi When returning to India he passed through Egypt and was entertained (along with other members of the mission) by Abdullah

13a This scheme, in which Sheikh Abdul Aziz Shawish was interested, was supported by the *Comrade* in a series of articles contributed by Abdur Rahman Siddiqi. See Bamford, *Histories*, p. 113.

14 See *Comrade*, 12 July 1913.

Talaat, the editor of *Al-Shaab*. On this occasion it was reported that Abdur Rahman, after extolling the work of the Nationalist Party in Egypt including Shawish and Ahmad Fuad[15] declared that Indians would spare nothing to uphold the Turkish Empire and in order to do so would tread every obstacle under foot.

17. There is evidence in the shape of a report from Cairo, dated the 19th March 1914, that the activities of the *Anjuman-i-Khuddam-i-Ka'aba* had already begun to attract attention there, and that the movement had taken hold in Egypt. Copies of the rules of the society, including those relating to the duties of the *Fidae* (*Shaidae*) were at that time in circulation and a statement made by an Indian student at *Al Azhar* was to the effect that the function of the *Fidae* was to engage in political crime.

A statement made by one Nasirullah Khan of the 'Citadel *Takia*' is recorded in which he describes the membership in Egypt and gave the names of three Egyptian members, one being Mahmud Salim and another Abdullah Talaat of *Al-Shaab*. Nasrullah said regarding himself that he was waiting for instructions from headquarters before starting a branch in Cairo. There was also a report that Zafar Ali also intended to start a branch (as we have said he helped to open a branch in London in the summer of 1914).

The report further alludes to an interview between Mahbub Alam of the *Paisa Akhbar* and Mahmud Salim mentioned above. Mahbub Alam informed the latter that the activities and objects of the *Anjuman* were being discussed already in Constantinople and that the Turks were hoping to derive advantage from its efforts, though he himself was doubtful about this inasmuch as Turkey possessed no fleet.

Further matters mentioned in this report were :

1. the journey of Hafiz Wahbi to India to serve the *Anjuman* ;
2. the efforts of Ahmad Fuad to send doctors to India on a pan-Islamic mission ; and

15 (1868-1936) ; Sultan (1917-1922) and king (1922-1936) of Egypt, founded the Egyptian University at Giza in 1908 ; succeeded his brother Hussein Kamil as Sultan ; when popular unrest forced British to end protectorate (1922), Ahma(e)d Fuad assumed title of king.

3. the visit to India of Adnan Bey and Kamal Omar Bey, who were working under cover of the Ottoman Red Crescent Society.

It is proved that Adnan Bey and Kamal Omar Bey visited India in February and March 1914 and it is also proved that after their return to Turkey they sent out to India a printed circular, dated the 28th July 1914, purporting to be on behalf of the Ottoman Red Crescent Society.[16]

The circular, after referring to the help given by India to Turkey during the Tripolitan and Balkan Wars, goes on to say that Turkey has put herself in readiness for a state of war and declares that in the event of any transgression on her honour and integrity no effort will be spared to resist it so as to guard the "*sacred places of Islam*". An appeal is then made for funds for the Red Crescent Society and the request is made that all sums collected may be sent direct "and without any intermediary as far as possible" to the Central Society at Constantinople.

The reference to the sacred places of Islam indicates that the appeal was being made directly to the *Anjuman-i-Khuddam i-Ka'aba* regarding which the authors of the circular had, no doubt, acquired information during their trip to India a few months before.

18. We may now pass on to consider certain evidence relating to the activities of persons known to have been connected with the *Anjuman*. We have read reports received from Egypt showing that attempts were being made there to tamper with the Indian troops. One of the persons so concerned was Haji Ghulam Naqshband. When searched after his arrest he was found to be in possession of a card showing that he was a member of the *Anjuman*. In March 1915, an Indian, Mohammad Shah Jilani, whose name we have already mentioned was arrested on a similar charge. From letters addressed by this man to Abdur Rahman Siddiqi it appears that before going to Egypt he had been on a mission to Penang and Singapore and judging from the language of his letters the object of that mission was to recruit members for the society. A statement made by a servant of Jilani shows that a branch

16 Also, see Bamford, *Histories*, pp. 116-117.

of the society had been started in Singapore, the president of which had signed a letter exhorting Muslims to jehad.

In June 1915, a statement was made by an Afghan residing in Constantinople that a branch of the society had been started there and that members of it had gone to Egypt to corrupt the Indian troops.

In June 1915, an Indian named Hafiz Naqib stated that a branch of the society had been opened in Cairo two years before by one Imam Din who had sent his subscription to Shaukat Ali. He mentioned other members, one of whom was Fazl Shah. The latter and Imam Din are said to have mingled with the Indian troops in Egypt.

Later on, i.e., in September 1915, this statement was corroborated by the statement of an Egyptian named Syed Effendi Mohammad. He, too, mentioned the name of Imam Din who, he said, had shown him copies of the rules of the society lithographed in Arabic.

With regard to the statement of the Afghan referred to above we may add that there is other evidence to show that the *Anjuman* had an office in Constantinople in the quarters occupied there by Sheikh Shawish.

19. In addition to this evidence of the activities of members of the society in Egypt we have definite evidence that two Indian members who left India in October 1914, joined the Turkish Army in the Hejaz.

In January 1915, a party of *Haj* pilgrims returned to Bombay and some of them reported that 700 Indians led by Ata Mohammad and Abdul Wahid A'ba had enlisted in the Turkish Army.

Ata Mohammad was a leading member of the *Anjuman* in Bombay and so was Abdul Wahid. There is evidence to show that after this Abdul Wahid was seen in Constantinople. Two letters posted at Geneva were intercepted by the Postal Censor in November 1915. These were addressed to relatives of Abdul Wahid and purported to be written by one Abdul Hasan Ul-Misri. The writing has been identified as that of B. Chattopadhyaya,[17] the head of the 'Indian National Party'

17 Birendrannth Chattopadhyaya (1818-1946) was a leading revolutionary; secretary of the 'Berlin Committee', ; went to Moscow after the Second World War and came into contact with Trotsky and Lenin. He died in exile in Moscow in January 1941.

in Berlin. The writer announced that he had seen Abdul Wahid in Constantinople.

20. Another member of the society, whose activities attracted attention, was a youth named Mohammad Iqbal *alias* Iqbal Ahmad or Iqbal Husain. He took service in the *Anjuman* for a time as a *shaidai* and the evidence shows that after his engagement he went across the North-West Frontier and began to recruit for the society there. From his own statement it would appear that he was encouraged and assisted by Qazi Abdul Wali of Peshawar, a fact which is established independently by a somewhat cryptic letter which he sent to Abdul Wali.

The reports of the movements of Mohammad Iqbal in trans-frontier territory indicate that he and the party with him met with some success in their mission until they were stripped and sent away naked by a number of unsympathetic Bunerwals.

The reports show that at a place called Charsadda, Mohammad Iqbal enlisted 45 members for the society. One of these was the Haji of Tarangzai, who is said to have joined as a *Shaidai*. This man, it may be noted, figures somewhat prominently in the history of the Silk Letter Conspiracy. It is stated that he was one of the persons to whom letters were sent by Ubaidullah from Kabul and the 'letters' show that he was nominated to an appointment in the 'Army of God'.[18]

21. We have already mentioned the name of Hafiz Wahbi (or Wahabi) who was appointed editor of the Arabic edition of the journal of the *Anjuman*. According to the reports he appeared in India about September or October 1913. There is plenty of evidence to show that previous to this he had been closely associated with Sheikh Shawish in Constantinople and that Shawish intended to send him on a mission to India. Before this intention could be carried out he and Shawish had a quarrel and Hafiz Wahbi then appears to have come to India on his own account and to have come straight to Dr. Ansari at Delhi...

26. Having now reviewed in detail the evidence relating to the *Anjuman-i-Khuddam-i-Ka'aba*, which has been laid before us, we may proceed to examine the defences put forward by Shaukat Ali and Mohamed Ali in this part of the case. What

18 Bamford, *Histories*, pp. 122-126.

they have to say on this subject will be found in the written statements submitted by them as also in the record of the interviews we had with them at Chhindwara on the 6th and 7th December 1918.

27. We have now to record our conclusion regarding the character and objects of the *Anjuman-i-Khuddam-i-Ka'aba*... We are satisfied from the evidence before us that it cannot be claimed that the society was a purely religious one. For this purpose we need go no further than the declarations contained in the published rules of the *Anjuman*. We fail to see how it can be contended that a society which binds its members by an oath to protect the holy places against "non-Muslim invasion" and which undertakes to contribute half its income to an "independent Muslim power" can claim to be a purely religious body merely by declaring that the contribution is to be devoted to a pious purpose, a condition which the members could not enforce against an independent power.

The real object can only be the support of an independent Muslim power and that is a political and not a religious object...

We have shown that the leading members of the society themselves were conscious of the difficulty of presenting the *Anjuman* to the Muslim public of India as a purely religious body—a difficulty which prompted the correspondence between Maulvi Abdul Bari and His Excellency the Viceroy to which we have referred. And we have also mentioned that Muslims at Aligarh and elsewhere challenged the assertion that the society had none but purely religious objects...[18]

Apart from these declarations the history of events which happened in Turkey before and at the time when the *Anjuman* was founded in India affords no uncertain evidence that the *Anjuman* had behind its professed religious objects a distinct political aim ; and bearing in mind that Mushir Husain, one of the founders, and Dr. Ansari, one of the members of the Central Committee, are both persons who had visited Turkey and had become intimate with the leading spirits of the Young

18 This is followed by references to various statements made by Mushir Husain Kidwai and Abdul Bari to prove that the *Anjuman* aimed to promote the pan-Islamic programme of Turkey.

Turks Party, it is impossible to doubt that the founders of the *Anjuman* drew their inspiration from Turkey.

It is plain from the evidence before us that the political leaders in Turkey had laid themselves out to exercise what influence they could upon Muslim visitors from India. No stronger testimony on this point could be had than the letters written by Mushir Husain and those sent to the *Comrade* in the early part of 1913 by Dr. Ansari and other members of the medical mission. And further proof of this is to be found in speeches made by Ansari after the return of his mission to India indicating that he thought less of the medical work which he had done than of the political results he had achieved in the way of establishing closer relations between Turkey and the Muslims of India.

And though, of course, it cannot be said that Mohamed Ali was ever brought into immediate relations with the politicians of Constantinople the fact remains that he was one of the principal organisers of the medical mission and took an active interest in the various schemes which came into being as the result of the visit of Ansari's mission to Turkey. We refer to the colonisation scheme, the campaign for the sale of Ottoman Bonds and the scheme for the Medina University, all matters in which Mohamed Ali admits having taken a prominent part, though he protests at the same time that there was nothing unlawful in his having done so.

His activities in connection with these projects are not, however, being charged against him as offences ; they are put forward as evidence of the strong interest he was taking in the internal affairs of Turkey. And this evidence is very material when we have to consider his connection with the *Anjuman* as one of its principal members.

It appears to us, therefore, that these events, which we have described, support the conclusion that the *Anjuman* in the hands of its principal officers was intended to be used as a means for the strengthening of Turkey as the leading Islamic power and that it was realised that this purpose could best be attained by an appeal to the religious sentiments of the Muslim population of India, ignorant people for the most part who would respond to call of "the faith in danger" without being in any way conscious that they were being invited to join or support a political movement.

We have referred to the evidence which shows that the society and its aims soon acquired a reputation both in Constantinople and in Egypt, and that branches of the society were started in both places. The evidence on this point is direct and convincing and shows clearly the opinion which was held regarding the aims of the society and the assistance which Turkey hoped to derive from its efforts.

IV

ARTICLES WRITTEN OR PUBLISHED BY MOHAMED ALI IN THE 'COMRADE' AND 'HAMDARD'

28. The...charges against Mohamed Ali in this connection is that articles published by him in the *Comrade* and *Hamdard* before the entry of Turkey into the war were likely to promote sympathy with Turkey, to excite hatred against Christians, to alienate the affections of His Majesty's Muslim subjects and to stir up ill-feeling against foreign powers in alliance with Great Britain; that after Turkey joined in the war articles were published by him in the *Hamdard* likely to promote sympathy with the Turks ; and that *inter alia* by the publication an inaccurate accounts of the strength of the King's enemies and exaggerated reports of their military successes ; he encouraged a belief that Britain and her allies were being defeated...

Articles of the same character appeared from time to time in Mohamed Ali's papers uptil the date of the declaration of war by Germany. Thus in the *Hamdard* of the 15th April 1914 we find a sympathetic reference to the establishment of friendly relations between Turkey and Germany. The latter is prepared to support Turkey and to restore the 'Islands'. Germany holds the Ottomans in high esteem and the latter value Germany's friendship which is contrasted with policy

*Mohamed Ali, in his written statement, suggested that it was sought to condemn him merely upon a few extracts taken from his writings and protested that this was not a proper way of inviting upon the general character of his articles.

of the Triple Alliance (*sic* Entente) which 'has shown to annihilate the Ottoman Kingdom'. The article concludes with the following passage :

"There is no doubt that the Islamic world has come to realise the value of Germany's friendship and the evil intentions of the Triple Alliance (*sic* Entente) and it is therefore our duty to encourage German influence."

He continued to produce articles in his papers declaring that Great Britain had no business whatever to enter the war. He returns again and again to the charge against Sir Edward Grey and his policy and suggests in the most offensive language that the plea of honour was nothing but a paltry excuse for intervention and that in reality Britain entered the war in the interests of her trade and business. He declares that there can be no great enthusiasm in this country for a war "which means no certain gain to the people of India but a good deal of certain loss". "How", he asks,

> can India be enthusiastic over a war which has been declared on account of some 'mysterious international obligations,' not of India, but of an Empire which can mean little that is conducive to enthusiasm in those that have been turned back from the shores of Canada after a bold challenge and a brave struggle, or even in those who in South Africa have to be satisfied with a crumb extorted by their sufferings in a passive resistance if not doled out as a matter of charity by the Boers against whom they had assisted the government of the self-same Empire.

This is extracted from an article in the *Comrade* of the 12th August 1914, an article which concluded as follows :

> If we cannot hastily command in others an enthusiasm for this war which we ourselves do not feel, let us once and for all assure Government that so far as we and those within the orbit of our influence are concerned, they can sleep in peace.

Articles in a similar strain kept on appearing both in the *Comrade* and *Hamdard* until the issue of the *Comrade*, dated the 26th September 1914, in which Mohamed Ali dealt with "The Choice of the Turks". It was the publication of this number of the paper which led to the institution of proceedings for the forfeiture of the paper's security and resulted in the disappearance of the *Comrade* in November 1914...

Thereafter, Mohamed Ali's writings were confined to the *Hamdard* and though it may fairly be said that their tone was in some degree more moderate, it is apparent that Mohamed Ali had not profited by the warning conveyed in the proceedings against the *Comrade*. The *Hamdard* of the 7th October 1914 published a violent attack on Russia and the alliance between Great Britain and Russia was described as "quite unnatural".

32. It was at this stage that Turkey entered the war and the situation of the Muslims in India became one of not unnatural anxiety.

The *Hamdard* assumed a tone of regret at Turkey's abandonment of neutrality, but continued nevertheless to excuse her act and to point out how it might have been avoided had Great Britain fulfilled her promise to evacuate Egypt and restore it to Turkey. The editor remarks that the war is a temporal one and that the Muslims may be expected to do their duty by the British Government, provided that "the holy land of Arabia is treated as sacrosanct". In another number was published the proclamation said to have been issued to the troops by Enver Bey. In an article of the 19th January 1915, it was suggested that by reason of the religious questions involved an inferior standard of loyalty could only be expected from India although it was added that the Government could legitimately demand the sacrifice of life and property from India.

An article of the 20th January 1915 applauded, or at any rate sought to justify, the violation by Turkey of Persian neutrality, an analogy being drawn between this act and the despatch of English troops to Belgium after the Germans had entered that country. It was suggested that Russia interfered with Persian neutrality before the Turks intervened. A similar article was published in the issue of the 22nd January.

Other articles appeared referring to the situation in Egypt. One of these was reproduced on the 26th January 1915 from a Kabul newspaper called the *Siraj-ul-Akhbar* in which it was declared that the British Government had taken Egypt on loan from the Turks. A complaint was made that Britain had compelled Egypt to remain neutral and that this had seriously effected the previously declared policy of Turkish neutrality.

In other words it was England who drove Turkey to range herself in the war as an ally of Germany. The article concluded with an opinion that the Turks should seize the opportunity to regain Egypt and that the occasion was favourable because the Arabs in Egypt and the Sudan were all on the side of the Ottoman Government.

Articles appearing on the 3rd and 4th February 1915 discussed the prospects of a Turkish invasion of the Suez Canal and hinted that they were not unfavourable though probably the Turks would have to risk great sacrifices. A further article of the 7th March 1915, while it purported to extol the loyalty and bravery of the Indian troops and their services to the Empire contained the following offensive passage :

"In 1878 the Indian troops were sent to the Mediterranean under the orders of the Secretary of State. This was at the time when Russia and Turkey were at war and it was apprehended that Constantinople might be occupied by the Russian Army *as at that time the British Government had not in view the destruction of the Ottoman Empire* the Indian Army was kept ready in the Mediterranean to guard Constantinople if necessary."

Again on the 10th March 1915 the *Hamdard* reproduced from an Egyptian paper a statement that the English were treating the Muslim population of Alexandria with great barbarity and were flogging the proprietors of newspapers and looting the cattle of agriculturists.

33. We think we have now quoted sufficiently from articles published in Mohamed Ali's paper for the purpose of showing his views regarding the war in general and India's duty in particular.

In the later articles published in the *Hamdard* a somewhat skilful attempt is made to avoid the imputation of anything savouring of disloyalty or sedition by the introduction of matter culled from English and German newspapers and other sources for which he might disclaim responsibility. At times he adopts a patriotic and loyal tone, but this effort is never maintained for long and he is unable to conceal his real feelings which he proceeds to express in a venomous sentence or two, the effect of which is to neutralize or counteract the import of what he has written before. It is not, in our opinion, to be denied that these articles, published just before the orders of

internment were passed, were intended to excite sympathy with the fortunes of Turkey and to damp, if not to kill, any enthusiasm on the part of the Muslims of India for the cause of the British Empire, of which they were citizens.

A prolonged and careful study of the articles published by Mohamed Ali has satisfied us that the charge put forward by the Government of India in respect of them are well founded. [Emphasis added by the editor].

V

ASSOCIATION WITH TURKISH VISITORS SUSPECTED OF BEING POLITICAL EMISSARIES OF THE TURKS

32. We have referred to this matter in that portion of our report which deals with the *Anjuman-i-Khuddam-i-Ka'aba.*

It is alleged against Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali that they associated with Turkish visitors, the names of whom were Syed Mohammad Tewfik (Taufiq), Adnan Bey, Kamal Omar Bey, Mustafa Sadiq and Hafiz Wahbi.

Acquaintance with all these men is admitted by the brothers, but they say that they had no reason to suspect these men of being political emissaries of Turkey and for the most part their case is that the acquaintance was of a casual nature.

35. With regard to Tewfik, the reports received by the Government of India show that he was touring in India in 1913 and the early part of 1914 and that he wrote to a paper in Constantinople (*Sabil-ur-Reshad*), letters in which he described his wanderings and the results of his observation. These letters are violently anti-British in tone and demonstrate clearly the nature of the political opinions he held. He was also without doubt an acquaintance of Abul Kalam Azad to whose paper he contributed at least one article.

Tewfik was present at the Muslim League meeting at Agra in December 1913, after which he came to stay at Delhi with Hakim Ajmal Khan. From there he paid a visit to Bhopal and returned to Delhi. It is shown that he toured in India

with Kamal Omar and Adnan Bey and left India with them in March 1914.

The evidence before us leaves no doubt that he was a political propagandist and we have been shown two letters written by him from Constantinople in August 1914 to Mazharul Haq and Maulvi Shibli Nomani in which he intimated very clearly that Turkey was ready for war and intended coming in on the side of Germany. Shaukat Ali and Mohamed Ali admit having met Tewfik, but say that they looked upon him as an adventurer who was trying to raise money in India for the purpose of starting an Islamic review or newspaper in Constantinople.

Mohamed Ali met him first in Bombay at the time of the return of Dr. Ansari's medical mission. He next met him in Delhi where he was a guest of Hakim Ajmal Khan. He states that Tewfik came to see him in Delhi accompanied by Abul Kalam Azad and added that he acted as an interpreter for Kamal Omar and Adnan Bey. Mohamed Ali describes Tewfik as being a native of Mesopotamia and says he heard afterwards that he became "M.P." for Baghdad.

36. As regards Kamal Omar and Adnan Bey, both brothers describe them as having come to India solely for the purpose of thanking the people who had supported the Ansari medical mission. They were officially connected with the Ottoman Red Crescent Society, Kamal being the brother of the President, Bessim Omar Pasha. Mohamed Ali says he never became intimate with them owing to the language difficulty.

37. Sami Bey became known to Mohamed Ali at Delhi: he gives an account of his meeting with him in his written statement in which he speaks of Sami Bey's adventurous career (see paragraph 45 of the written statement). Sami was accompanied by a young Arab Lieutenant (Mustafa Sadiq). He states that the whole of the conversation he had with Sami Bey related to the latter's adventures. He admits having travelled as far as Bhopal with Sami Bey when the latter and the lieutenant were on their way to Bombay...

38. On the materials before us it is very difficult to say what degree of significance should be attributed to the acquaintance between these visitors and the two brothers.

In the case of Tewfik it may fairly be said that Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali could hardly have failed to be cognisant

of the fact that he was taking much interest in Indian affairs and was a hostile critic of the British Government. Both brothers admit their intimacy with Abul Kalam Azad to whose paper (*Al-Hilal*) Tewfik had contributed an anti-British article before they met him and they can hardly have been ignorant of his opinions. Again in the case of Hafiz Wahbi there is good deal that is not explained. We have adverted to the fact, that there are conflicting stories regarding the manner in which he came to visit India. We have little doubt that he was previously known to Dr. Ansari, although Ansari denies the fact, the contrary is stated by Abdul Bari and Wahbi himself. The probabilities are that Ansari knew Wahbi in Constantinople as a friend of Abdul Aziz Shawish and for that reason received him and took him up when he came to Delhi, though it is likely that at this time he had not become aware of the rupture between Wahbi and Shawish.

Ansari probably thought—that use could be made of Hafiz Wahbi in connection with the Society of the *Khuddam-i-Ka'aba* and he introduced him accordingly to Shaukat Ali and afterwards to Abdul Bari who gave him a post under the society. Afterwards, Wahbi was got rid of on account of some communication received from Shawish by Ansari. All we can say on this point is that the association between Hafiz Wahbi and these prominent members of the *Khuddam-i-Ka'aba* society was of a most suspicious character, regard being had to Wahbi's antecedents and to his connection with the intriguer Shawish, and Shaukat Ali at least was not altogether ignorant of his previous history and agreed to use him for the purpose of extending the operations of the society to Egypt and Constantinople....

It is doubtful whether any importance can be attached to the visit of Sami Bey and Mustafa Sadiq, though we admit that the reason given for their journey across India by Mohamed Ali is not very convincing. At the same time we desire to say that in view of the continuous attempts which were being made to establish closer relations between Turkey and the Indian Muslims of the pan-Islamic views entertained and expressed by Mohamed Ali and of the activities of the society of the *Khuddam-i-Ka'aba* the Government of India had substantial reasons for suspecting that the visits of these men to India during a period of several months immediately prior to the

war were not unconnected with political matters, *and that they were justified in taking these matters into consideration for the purpose of deciding whether Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali could safely be allowed to remain at liberty during the course of war.* [Emphasis added by the editor].

VI

RELATIONS BETWEEN THE BROTHERS AND CERTAIN INDIANS SUSPECTED OF HAVING ENGAGED IN TREASONABLE ACTIVITIES

39. Both Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali admit friendship with Ubaidullah who was well-known to them at Delhi where he conducted a school known as the *Nazarat-ul-Ma'arif*; and they both admit having been with him at the Educational Conference held at Rawalpindi at the end of December 1914. From there they went on to Peshawar with Abul Kalam Azad who is also their friend.

The evidence before us shows that this association at the conference was only a few months previous to the flight of the students from Lahore across the border, one of the incidents connected with the "Silk Letter" case in which Ubaidullah and Abul Kalam Azad were deeply involved. With regard to Ubaidullah both the brothers have stated that they heard he went afterwards to Kabul on the invitation of the Amir who asked Ubaidullah to reorganise the course of Islamic studies in the Habibia College.

In addition to this both brothers admit acquaintance with Maulana Mahmudul Hasan whom they both profess to admire as an eminent Muslim divine.

40. It is not claimed by the government that either Shaukat Ali or Mohamed Ali were actively concerned in the 'Silk Letter' conspiracy but it is of importance to note that they were friends of three of the men who were prominently concerned in it and their admission of the respect in which they hold Mahmudul Hasan is some confirmation of the statement made by Mohammad Mubin to the effect that it was

known that Shaukat Ali and Mohamed Ali 'shared Mahmudul Hasan's view'.

It may reasonably be inferred that they also knew and shared the opinions of Abul Kalam Azad and Ubaidullah and so although the extent of the criminal activities of these three conspirators was not revealed to government till a considerable period had elapsed from the date of the internment of the two brothers. *We have no hesitation in saying that their more or less intimate association with these conspirators before their internment, furnished a very weighty reason for the refusal of the Government of India to release them* [Emphasis supplied by editor].

VII

OTHER ACTIVITIES OF MOHAMED ALI AND SHAUKAT ALI

41. These form the subject of the 5th paragraph of the "Statement of Reasons" for the internment and constitute a general charge, the purport of which is that the brothers were more or less constantly engaged in agitation tending to foment ill-will towards the British Government.

There is a good deal of general evidence to show that they had become notorious for fishing in troubled waters. It cannot be denied that their interference in the affairs of the Aligarh College and the proposed Muslim University created much unrest, and they used the considerable influence which they acquired over the students for the purpose of subverting discipline and creating complications with the European staff who were girded at as being the proteges of Government. In fact both Shaukat Ali and Mohamed Ali appear to have directed their efforts towards the release of the college from all control. It is also well-established that they both took a prominent part in stirring up ill-feeling towards Government over the Kanpur case ; some of the articles relating to this case which appeared in Mohamed Ali's papers were grossly provocative and he seems to have deliberately put forward the most outrageous charges against Government and its officers

alleging that the riot had been wantonly planned for the purpose of furnishing a pretext for the shooting of unoffending Muslims....

42. While we do not wish to press this general evidence... it is our duty to say that the Government of India were fully entitled to take *cognisance of the notoriety which the two brothers had acquired as agitators and to act upon their knowledge. The fact that Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali were devoted to mischievous agitation was a strong reason for subjecting them to restraint* [italicised by editor] for it is only too obvious that such propensities if left uncontrolled were likely to result in disturbance which might have interfered materially with the successful prosecution of the war.

VIII

CONDUCT OF MOHAMED ALI AND SHAUKAT ALI SINCE THEIR INTERNMENT

44. We desire (however) to offer a few observations regarding one very important matter—namely, their refusal to sign the undertaking drafted by Sir Charles Cleveland except with certain modifications which were introduced in a draft which they put forward for the acceptance of Government.

The sum and substance of their explanation of this matter is that their only desire was to safeguard themselves against the risk of their being interfered with in the performance of public worship. They refer to the language of the *Khutba* which prescribes a prayer for the Khalifa of Islam and his aims, and say that as part of their ritual they could not omit a prayer prescribed by authority and sanctioned by immemorial usage. They mention that attempts had been made to interfere with their observance of this form at the time of worship, that a government order had issued restraining them from reciting this prayer which was subsequently withdrawn with an assurance that nothing would be done to prevent their worship in accordance with established forms.

They contend that the only object of their proposal that the form of undertaking should be modified in the sense suggested by them was to secure themselves from molestation during worship after their release, and Mohamed Ali has stated to us that the words which he desired to have introduced were merely conventional and practically superfluous.

He appeals to a letter sent by him to Sir James DuBoulay on the 24th October 1917 in which he says this explanation of the qualifying words was given, and we find from the copy of the letter supplied to us that the words were intended to relate to 'recognised religious beliefs and practices' and that a protest was made for this reason against their being understood as concealing any sinister import and we note more over that the letter contained an express admission that in view of the fact that the fullest religious freedom is already guaranteed to every subject of His Majesty the addition of the words was "unnecessary and superfluous". But we are not told that in spite of this admission the brothers expressed their willingness to sign the undertaking as drafted by Sir Charles Cleveland. We are led for this reason to conclude that the explanation of the refusal to sign the original draft is disingenuous and specious.

If the only desire of the brothers was to protect their right to observe a form of prayer binding upon their conscience nothing could have been easier than to say so in language which would clearly explain the object aimed at, particularly as they admit that government had already disclaimed all intention of disturbing their form of worship. It is significant that in the letter to Sir James DuBoulay the reference was made not merely to religious practices "but to religious beliefs" and we cannot help thinking that the brothers were attempting to secure for themselves a wider liberty than that of saying their prayers as they had been used to. Our opinion in this matter is confirmed by the language of a telegraphic message which they asked Mr. Corbett to communicate to Maulvi Abdul Bari on the 16th September 1917. The latter had wired as follows: "*Can't you inform me details of your reply to our Criminal Intelligence Department friends* ?" The reply was:

> Government required undertaking not to encourage or assist King's enemies nor attack his friends, refrain unconstitutional violent methods. We replied we accept above all else

God's commandments as conveyed through Quran Hadis without prejudicing this faith on condition fullest religious liberty willing give undertaking if still required.

And finally we may refer to the letter purporting to have been written by the mother of Shaukat Ali and Mohamed Ali in which she gives her version of what took place between the brothers and Mr. Abdul Majid when the latter came to ask them to sign the undertaking.* We can find nothing in this letter nor in the telegram intended for Abdul Bari to indicate that the sole objection to the signing of the undertaking was a mere apprehension of interference with the form of their prayers : and we think it right to say that their refusal to sign a statement which required from them nothing more than a promise to behave as good and loyal citizen was one of the strongest reasons conceivable for the action of Government in declining to set them at liberty.

IX

FINDINGS

45. We find the first charge proved. The whole question raised in this charge is discussed in the portion of our report which deals with the history of the society of the *Khuddam-i-Ka'aba.*

On the second charge we have found that both the brothers associated with visitors from Turkey whom the Government of India had good reason to suspect of being political emissaries of the Turks.

The third charge which is against Mohamed Ali only is established. The fourth charge is also proved for the reasons related in that section of our report dealing with the *Anjuman-i-Khuddam-i-Ka'aba.*

On the fifth charge we find that both the brothers exercised their influence to further the interests of Turkey and in doing so attempted to promote ill-feeling against the British Government and its policy.

*See Appendix I below.

X

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

46. Having now recorded our findings on the charges submitted to us, it only remains for us to say that having regard to the acts done and the opinion expressed by Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali previous to the date of their internment, the Government of India were fully justified in imposing restrictions upon their liberty, and to add that the conduct of the brother since their internment has been sufficient justification for the refusal to release them during the period of the war....

Those views are, in our opinion, accurately summed up by Mr. Corbett in the account he gives of what passed between himself and the two brothers at the interview in September 1917. Writing of Mohamed Ali, he says :

> If he is genuine about anything he is first and last a fanatical Muslim, and he considers that the spiritual power of Islam is essentially bound with the temporal power of Turkey...So long as England and Turkey are enemies he claims as a matter of religious liberty to side with Turkey....

To elicit an expression of his (Mohamed Ali's) opinion, we put to him the following question :

> If A and B, non-Muslim powers are at war with each other and if C (i.e. the Khalifa) comes to the assistance of A, and for that purpose declares *jihad*, what is the position of the Muslim subjects of the other non-Muslim power ?

He answers the question at first in general terms saying that he had taken the opinion of Abdul Bari on it but finally delivered his answer to the concrete question put by saying that in such a case the Muslim subjects of B could give no assistance against C (the Khalifa) in such a war "whether by word, deed, money or arms, or in any way whatsoever".

In other words England and Germany being at war and Turkey having thrown in her lot with Germany and proclaimed *jihad* the Muslims of India were under an obligation to maintain a position of rigid neutrality.

48. We take it therefore that Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali believe, or profess to believe, that by reason of their

religious faith the Muslims of India are under no bond of temporal, allegiance to the British but owe allegiance, both spiritual and temporal, to the Sultan of Turkey or any other Muslim sovereign who is for the time being the *Khalif-ul-Islam*.

49. This may be the view of Mohamed Ali and of Abdul Bari also, that the contrary opinion has been pronounced by eminent Muslim theologians though probably neither Shaukat Ali nor Mohamed Ali would accept them as being reliable and independent *alims* (*sic*).

One of the members of this committee, Mr. Abdur Rauf has brought to notice a *fatwa* given long ago by Maulvi Abdul Hai of Firangi Mahal, Lucknow...The question put to Abdul Hai was :

> If Muslim subjects are residing in the kingdom of non-believers who do not interfere with the performance of their religious rites and the Muslims have no capacity for *jihad* as is the case in Hindustan, is *jihad* incumbent (*Wajib*) ?

The answer is in the negative. Another *fatwa* published by Maulana Abdur Rashid of Gangohi (a divine of great renown) was given out so long ago as 1898 and declared that Indian Muslims are bound by their religion to be loyal to the British Government even if it be engaged in war with the Sultan of Turkey. The *fatwa* was published in a well-known Muslim newspaper, the *Al-Bashir* of Etawah just before Turkey entered the war and we are given to believe that one of the *alims* (*sic*) who accepted it and subscribed to it was the now notorious Maulana Mahmudul Husan for whose views as a theologian, both Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali profess a profound respect.

These *fatwas* (*sic*) are in accord with the opinion which has long been held by writers on Muslim law that India is *Dar-ul-Islam* and not *Dar-ul-Harb*, and the whole question is discussed in a treatise on Muslim jurisprudence of recent date, written by Justice Abdur Rahim of the Madras High Court. In Chapter XII of his book he discusses the authorities and refers to the circumstances which determine whether non-Muslim territory is to be considered '*Dar-ul-Islam*' (i.e., territory of safety) or *Dar-ul-Harb* (i.e., territory of war). He points out that under the conditions in which Muslims live in India it must be held that India is "*Dar-ul-Islam*". He shows how there is no interference in India with the religious rights

of Muslims. "The Friday and Id prayers are held all over India and recognized to be validly held according to the Muslim Canonical law". He also shows that the Muslims of India enjoy absolute protection of person and property and also religious freedom, while their own laws relating to religious institutions and usages and those governing family relations and succession and certain forms of transfer of property are enforced by the Anglo-Indian courts. In short, it appears to be well settled that so long as the British Government does not interfere with the performance of their religious duties Muslims are bound to treat India as *Dar-ul-Islam*, and to remain loyal to the State.

The doctrines put forward by Mohamed Ali and his brother are opposed not only to the interests of the State but to the teaching of Islam itself.

50. We are required by the Government of India to advise upon two questions :

(a) Whether the orders of restraint passed against Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali are justified in the light of the material placed before us ? and,

(b) Whether, if their detention was justified, they or either of them may now be released from the restrictions imposed upon them or subjected to milder restrictions in view of their conduct since their arrest or of any other circumstances making such a course desirable ?

We have already advised on the first question.

51. On the second question our advice is that Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali should now be released.

*While we have no reason to believe that they have in any way changed the views they held before the war, we understand that their internment was undertaken as a war measure ; and in view of the fact that the war is now virtually over, although peace terms have not yet been signed it appears to us there is no longer occasion to apprehend that any views or activities of theirs can interfere with the relations between Great Britain and Turkey.**

H. Rauf
B. Lindsay

*This paragraph is not italicised in the original. It has been done so by the editor.

51. To Manzur Ahmad

Chhindwara
17 December 1918

With reference to your letter of this morning we desire to state as follows :

(1) The following relations have already died :

Begum Majid Ali, niece and wife of nephew, also sister-in-law of Mr. Shaukat Ali.

Daughter of above.

Begum Khurshed Ali, sister's daughter and wife of brother's son, brought up like our own daughter.

Mr. Khurshed Ali, deceased brother's son brought up like our own.

Begum Usman Ali, niece and wife of sister's son permission to attend whose wedding was sought a few months ago. The father of Mr. Usman Ali and Begum Khurshed Ali, our only sister's husband, had died only a few months before our internment, and they were being supported by us to some extent.

These deaths have occurred during a fortnight practically, and do not include the deaths of a nephew and of his brother-in-law and his nephew a week or two previously.

The only sick relation that has so far survived is our only sister, mother of Begum Khurshed Ali and Mr. Usman Ali.

(2) Not only we two but the whole family must go, though we must clearly state that we cannot afford the travelling expenses which should be defrayed by Government as already applied for. The relationship of the deceased and the sick sister is the same with both of us, and Begum Mohamed Ali is the first cousin of Begum Khurshed Ali and Begum Usman Ali and the niece of our sister, and must accompany us. Naturally the children too must go, and in any case neither they nor my wife can be left here alone.

(3) The undertaking required will be given ; but if our sister does not improve sufficiently within the week allowed for our stay at Rampur we may have to apply for the necessary extension. We shall stay only at Rampur, the capital of the State.

Government is aware how many relations have passed away while we awaited its decision, and further delay is not unattended with similar apprehensions. We therefore trust that permission to proceed to Rampur and the grant of money applied for will be sanctioned by wire immediately. Kindly make this clear in your telegram.

52. To S.R. Pandit

Chhindwara
21 December 1918

With reference to your urgent letter just received, we have to say that the bare railway fares to Rampur and back for us and our household amount to about one thousand rupees and with dining car charges for three days of the outward and three days of the return journey and coolie hire and conveyance hire etc. and other incidental journey expenses the total would mount up to the Rs 1,500 (fifteen hundred rupees) for which we had applied in our wire to the Chief Secretary on 4th December....On the 9th instant too in our wire we had applied for sanction of the amount mentioned in our wire of the 4th instant. In our letter to Mr. Manzur Ahmad dated 17th instant we had also said that these travelling expenses "should be defrayed by Government as applied for". We had also applied on the 4th December for another Rs 1,500 for repayment of local debts, for although we are to return after our visit home, we do not like those who had given us such credit to have to wait for repayment *after* our return. So kindly ask the Local Administration *immediately* for Rs 3,000, half for travelling expenses and the other half for repayment of local creditors. As Mr. Slocock knows, we have other debts besides these, incurred on account of the meagreness of our subsistence allowance for which we have already applied to Government; but the local debts ought to be paid before we leave Chhindwara even on a short visit home.

We hope to leave by the 10 A.M. train on Monday morning via Jabalpur, Allahabad, Lucknow, so kindly arrange for a reserved second class carriage to be attached at Jabalpur and to run through Allahabad and Lucknow on the Mail. We shall arrange with the Station Master here ourselves for the accommodation on the journey to Jabalpur on the 23rd morning.

53. To S.R. Pandit

Chhindwara
22 December 1918

Rs 1,500 is a very reasonable sum, as I explained in my letter last night. We are twelve persons travelling Second class, five servants travelling Third class and two companions or tutors and one governess and one maid servant travelling Intermediate class. However, as two of the children will travel with half ticket each and two servants also with half tickets, the number in each case should be reduced to the extent of one for calculating the fares.

The fares used to be Rs 35 for Second Class, Rs 16-4-0 for Intermediate and Rs 11 for Third, and I presume they have not been increased, and I know that they have not been reduced. These are for single journey, and there is no reduction now for return fares, so you have to calculate the exact double for the two journeys. Thus 11 seconds make Rs 770 : 4 Inters make Rs 130 and 4 Thirds make Rs 88. Total, as I wrote to you last night, about Rs 1,000.

Kindly add 6 days' dining car charges @ Rs 4 per day for the 11 Second class tickets, making Rs 264, same number of days for 4 Inters @ Re 1 per day, making Rs 24, and same for 4 Thirds @ 12 As per day, making Rs 18--Total Rs 306.

Kindly add coolie hire and conveyance charges and telegraphic charges etc. and other incidental expenses at so many changing places on such a long journey, and cost of packing cases etc. I think you will acknowledge that my estimate of Rs 1,500 was very reasonable, and you cannot cut

it down except by a few rupees at the utmost if cheeseparing has got to be done for the sake of appearances, which I should not like to associate with you.

P.S. I have already arranged about reserved *Purdah* accommodation. Possibly it would cost more; but I shall risk that.

54. From the Raja of Mahmudabad

Kaiserbagh
Lucknow
13 January 1919

Many thanks for your kind and touching letter.[1] You have rightly compared me to a mountain—all bulk and no intelligence. The trip to Chhindwara with all its difficulties was very pleasant indeed compared to the place of your present sojourn.

I wish I could come, but I am sorry it is impossible.

Under the present circumstances, I do not think I will be in a position to alter my opinion regarding the presidentship of the League.[2] I will always be devoted to my community.

Please remember me to your brother.

1 Mohamed Ali's letter is not traceable.

2 In the event of Mahmudabad's refusal to preside, Hakim Ajmal Khan was elected president of the League session held at Amritsar in December 1919. The Raja, in any case, was nobody's favourite. His role in the Muslim University movement was bitterly criticised by Mohamed Ali, while his proximity to Harcourt Butler caused serious misgivings. He also differed with his Muslim League colleagues on the question of the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms. The Raja favoured their acceptance while the general consensus, as it evolved at the Amritsar session of the League, was to reject them.

55. From Abdur Rahman Siddiqi

Delhi
7 February 1919

I have not written to you since long. I have been worried a good deal over one thing or another. Dear old Bijnori has left Shuaib and me absolutely helpless.[1] Prince Hamidullah Khan in a fit of grief and also perhaps affection for me proposed that I should go to Europe.[2] When the matter was seriously broached to him by Ansari he promised to give a definite answer within a week and today it is more than three weeks and the answer has not come. Then a beautiful offer has come from Hyderabad and I have already written accepting it. Let us see if C.I.D. friends and members of the Corps Diplomatique intervene now also as they did when I was being appointed at Aligarh[3]. Mind you this is not impossible. Shuaib's case is still practically in the air and one does not know what to do with him.

His [Shuaib] health at present is very bad. After the two attacks of influenza he had to bear the terrible shocks at Bhopal. Along with these Baron Reuter has had his influence on him. Then came the Congress and the League with terribly hard work. He was already a skeleton and this hard work floored him. The result is that at the slightest excuse he gets fever. His constipation is all gone. He has been forbidden to touch meat but vegetables too he cannot digest. He has grown very weak and has been much pulled down. Rahman[4] has suggested that he should lie in bed and take rest and that is what he is doing. But an active spirit like his cannot be imprisoned so easily. Still he has of late—last week—been showing distinct signs of improvement and the doctors say that he will be quite well in about a month or so.

1 Abdur Rahman *Bijnori died in 1918.*

2 Prince Hamidullah Khan went to England where he remained during the 1920s and 1930s.

3 Abdur Rahman Siddiqi tried for a post as Assistant Professor of History at Aligarh in 1915 but was turned down for political reasons. A.R. Siddiqi to Mohamed Ali, 6 July 1915, MAP.

4 Dr. Abdul Rahman (b. 1886) a leading physician of Delhi who took a *prominent* part in the *Khilafat and Non-cooperation movements.* He was a close friend and associate of the Ali Brothers and Dr. M.A. Ansari.

After all this interlude let us start our *Gup* columns. Everybody believed that your visit to Rampur was only the first instalment of your release. But your return indicates to me that you have not yet established yourself in the good grace of the Finance Member, the Education Secretary, and the C.I.D. head. Is it not possible that this Criminal Law Amendment Bill is being passed specially for you in order to keep you out of public life for a period of two years more? The Bill was introduced yesterday by Vincent who delivered a very idiotic speech they say.[5] It never occurred to me to apply for passes or else I too would have seen the great Jinnah vomit forth all the fire that his new wife has left in him.[6] They say he delivered a thundering good speech. Malaviya spoke for 2½ hours and completely exhausted the patience of everybody. Banerjea too opposed but not with his old vigour. Will you believe that Fazalbhai[7] and Zulfiqar Ali Khan[8] are also going to oppose the Bill. Only two Indians are going to support it. Their names are not known but Nawab Ali[9] and Shafi[10] carry the largest number of votes. The attitude of Sastri[11], Sapru[12] too is not known. They may oppose but mildly. In a meeting of the Indian members it was suggested that all should leave the Council at once. But Sastri, Sapru and Banerjea declined to do so and favoured the idea of amending it in the Select Committee.[13] The general consensus of opinion is that the

5 Based on the recommendations of the Rowlatt Committee, the Home Member, William Vincent, introduced the Criminal Law (Emergency Powers) Bill on 6 February 1919.

6 For the text of Jinnah's speech, see M. Rafique Afzal (ed.), *Selected Speeches and Statements of the Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah* (Lahore, 1966), pp. 84-113. In March 1919, the Rowlatt Bill was passed. On 28 March, Jinnah resigned from the Imperial Legislative Council as a protest against the passing of the Rowlatt Bill. For the letter of resignation, see *ibid*, pp. 112-113.

7 Fazalbhoy Currimbhoy (b. 1872), merchant and millowner of Bombay and a keen advocate of Muslim education as member of the *Anjuman-i-Islam of Bombay*: trustee of Aligarh College and member of the Muslim University Foundation Committee.

8 Zulfiqar Ali Khan (b. 1873) of Malerkotla was educated in Aitchison College, Lahore, before joining government service as Extra Assistant Commissioner; resigned, 1895; joined the service of his state of Patiala, and became its Chief Minister; member, Imperial Legislative Council, 1910.

Viceroy is determined to see the Bill become an Act at the earliest possible opportunity.

Another item in my *Gup* is that the Sofs sent a message saying that the Ali Brothers should now be released. But Mohamed's old friend who called on him in London before embarking for India has suggested that the time has not yet arrived when you can be safely let go. Nobody here seems to give any credence to this. There is another *Bazar Gup* also and that is that brother Rauf has reported very favourably and your release has been recommended by the Home Member also. The file is with the Viceroy who is said to be sitting tight on it for the last 15 or 20 days. My own personal impression is that after passing the new coercive measures they will release you under some very strict conditions. Well let us wait and see.

Our friends in Aligarh must have told you the details of the part played there by the Imran brothers and that recognized leader of united India, the Raja of Mahmudabad. Well that is what the world has come to. Have you people seen the latest issue of the *Al-Nazir* in which dear old Mohamed has come in for a good deal of criticism ? Do send for a copy and see it.

9 Syed Nawab Ali Chaudhuri (1863-1929), a prominent zamindar of Mymensingh district and a leading figure in the Muslim League ; member, Bengal Legislative Council, 1912-16 ; member, Imperial Legislative Council, 1916-20. The Nawab was a consistent supporter of the Raj.

10 Mohammad Shafi (1869-1932) was president of the Muslim League in 1913 and member of the provincial and imperial legislative councils, 1909-1919. Like Nawab Ali, he was a staunch ally of the British Government and a critic of the Congress movement

11 V.S. Srinivasa Sastri (1869-1946), one of the early Congress leaders ; president, Servants of India Society after the death of Gokhale on 19 February 1915 ; president, National Liberal Federation, 1932 : attended the first and second Round Table Conferences in London.

12 For views of Tej Bahadur Sapru, see S.K. Bose, *Tej Bahadur Sapru* (Publication Division, Delhi, 1978), pp. 39-41.

13 The Criminal Law (Emergency Powers) Bill was referred to a Select Committee on 7 February 1919. A joint note of dissent was attached to the Report of the Select Committee by Sastri, Shafi and Banerjea. When the Report of the Committee was considered on 12 March, Banerjea moved the amendment that it be referred to the High Courts, the local governments and public bodies for opinion.

The chairman's speech has been forfeited by His Majesty in the Punjab.[14] How lovely! Dear old Ansari is quite elated at this fresh mark of honour and Fazlul Haq has actually sent a letter of congratulations expressing his great grief at not being honoured similarly.

Shuaib has gone to Aligarh to fetch Khwaja. They propose to make a protest against the proceedings of the last meeting.

Mine host Rahman sends heaps of love to you both and so do I and also Shuaib who though not here would join us in sending love.

14 This refers to the speech of M.A. Ansari which was delivered at the Muslim League session held in Delhi in December 1918.

56. To James DuBoulay*

Chhindwara
18 February 1919

After having waited for more than two months for the decision of the Government on the report of the Committee that inquired into the case of our internment, I venture today to write to ask whether any decision has yet been arrived at, and, if so, what it is? In case government has not yet arrived at any decision, we shall be glad to know when one may be expected.

After a consideration of the patience and fortitude with which we have so far borne the loss of our liberty, you will, I trust, yourself admit that this enquiry is not the result of any impatience on our part. Four years constitute a no small slice in any man's life, and even if some little impatience is discernible after a paralysis of all activity save that of thought and emotion, for so long a period, and that too in the case of persons used to a life of more than average activity, it would

*Home Poll. A, July 1919, 1 & K.W., NAI.

only argue that the liberty lost was not an unprized possession.

Had all this period been merely a blank, it would even then have been no small grievance. But the blank has been amply filled in by sufferings and privations which I have no desire to discuss here. It is necessary, however, to state that, leaving out of account the mental anguish that we have so long endured and that daily vexations of a detenu's life that we have had to bear, we have sustained large material losses. We had to forego the profits of our industry and intelligence that would have normally amounted to more than a lakh of rupees in the last four years in the case of each of us ; while we have been made to shoulder the heavy burden of Rs 60,000, being the amount of out-of-pocket expenses unavoidably incurred mainly on account of the interest that has accrued during our internment on capital previously borrowed for our concerns. The two together amount to little short of three lakhs of rupees.

All that we have received in lieu of the normal profits of business is the subsistence allowance (including, in the case of my brother, the pension he had already earned after 17 years of meritorious public service) which originally amounted to Rs 250 per mensem for each of us, and was, after more than a year and a half of internment, raised to Rs 300. In June last, after another interval of more than a year and a half, this was increased to Rs 400 per mensem, and these subsequent increases, though themselves far from adequate, as we have only too frequently been driven to show, for the maintenance of large families of growing children, whose educational and other wants have doubled in these four years, and all the more so when the level of prices of all commodities has risen far above the high water-mark of any famine,—I submit that these increases sanctioned by Government themselves imply that the allowances as previously fixed were wholly inadequate. And yet no heed has been paid to our repeated representations that retrospective effect should be given to the orders sanctioning the increases, so that we could recoup ourselves for part of the sale proceeds of our *jagirs* and other property with the help of which we at first eked out the meagre subsistence allowances, and could repay the debts, local and otherwise, which we were forced to incur on account

of ordinary household expenditure, even on the reduced scale of living in our exile here, when we had exhausted these few resources left to us after our internment and the strangulation of the *Hamdard*.

As regards the out-of-pocket expenses, Government has twice refused to accept any liability for them, though it arose directly out of our internment, and this decision has been based on the mistaken ground that they are "business losses", as if we were free during our internment and exile to carry on business of any kind, and in the course of it risked these losses in the vain hope of possible and probable gain.

Add to these the loss of so many of our nearest relations and dearest friends whom we could not see even in their last moments ; the ill-health we ourselves and our people had to suffer, and last, but not least, the anguish of our mother, ill suppressed and vainly disguised during all these years, every one of which has aged her like five years of normal life,—add these and you will not, I feel sure, accuse us of any impatience if we now desire to know when precisely the orders of internment that have brought all these sufferings upon us and ours will finally be cancelled.

In recounting these sufferings, however, I do not desire that pity for us should cause government to deviate even by a hair's breadth from the path of stern duty that it may have chalked out for itself. Neither my brother nor I, and, I need hardly say, still less our mother, who has of her own free will, and even against our wishes, shared our exile from the very first day, ever felt any desire to put forward any appeal *ad misericordiam*. Nor do we feel any such desire now that we have already gone through the worst, and have little anxiety for anything that the future may yet have in store for us. We have always asked for justice and claim nothing but that today.

But I may well add that, on the other hand, we have also never felt any desire to appear contumacious, and in so simple and ordinary a matter as safeguarding our religious beliefs and observances, which after all is the plain duty of every one of us who has a soul to be saved, and believes, as he must, that the claims of personal salvation hereafter rank even above those of public safety here, we should be sorry to appear to pose as heroes and martyrs. Such sufferings and privations

as ours have only too often been the lot of mankind, in all ages and climes, and even today so many of our own countrymen and co-religionists have had to bear far worse things than have yet fallen to our share. Their example, if nothing else, should prevent us from indulging in any such pretensions, and, in fact, brace us up for such further sufferings as the future may bring.

But even apart from a consideration of the cases of those of our co-religionists that have suffered like us or even more than ourselves, Government has had ample opportunity of late to judge whether the belief held by us and our fellow-sufferers are peculiar to ourselves and held or paraded merely to disconcert and embarass it, or are, on the contrary, shared by all our co-religionists, educated and ignorant, laymen and divines. Even those that were never "politically-minded" are at last saying precisely what we had so often said long before our internment, and no penalties that we have been made to suffer in the interval have silenced the protests with which India is ringing today from one end to the other, while internment has sealed our lips and removed us from all contact with our people. All this, I feel confident, must force government to one and only one conclusion, namely, that we have been only normal Muslims, distinguished, if at all, by nothing more than a frank and fearless exposition of the innermost thoughts of our people, and that in reality we have in the process of this exposition exposed ourselves to manifold risks of official misunderstanding and private malice less in our own interests or even those of our people than of a government alien in race, and religion, and therefore all the more in need of such exposition.

But whether we have merely been interpreters of views universally held by our people or advocates of any views of our own not so universally shared, we submit we have never stepped beyond the limits of the fundamental inalienable right of every man to determine freely for himself what shall be his faith, and to practise it and preach it without fear or hindrance so long as he does not thereby interfere with his fellow men practising and preaching the faiths that they have equally freely determined for themselves. This is the basis of religious toleration, and one of the main foundations on which the allegiance of the subject to his sovereign stands and supports itself.

All this, however, needs no repetition after the submission of our representations to the Committee. I hope the Government has found time to consider them and the report of the Committee of Inquiry, and will soon announce its final decision. In expressing this hope I may, I hope without offence, recall that much delay has unfortunately taken place almost at every stage in these protracted proceedings. I need say nothing now of the release foreshadowed early in September 1917, but for some reason subsequently refused, though it is clear that the "previous papers" that were then generally believed to have come in the way of our release, including letters to his Majesty the Amir of Kabul and to our religious preceptor, were not put forward now as reasons for continuing our internment, nor placed before the Committee. But to come to more recent times, even after the Government's acceptance of the recommendations of Mr. Surendranath Banerjea that Committees should be appointed to examine the cases of the interned, nothing was done for many months so far as we were concerned. We understand that it was not until July 1918 that the Home Member began to express the desire of Government to appoint a Committee to inquire into our case; but no such Committee was in fact appointed until the end of September, and even then the statement of charges was not furnished to us for a month and a half. No doubt when this had been furnished, we were required to submit our written defence, if we had any to submit, without delay; and we were practically given but a bare week in which to submit it. It is also true that the Committee did not take long to go through our representations, and examined us in person soon after and left Chhindwara early in December. We understood that it submitted its report not long afterwards ; but the decision of the Government of India has not yet been announced, and we are still kept in suspense here, while our families are kept in still greater suspense at Rampur, since they do not know whether they should rejoin us here, and are not enabled to settle down at home either. Need we add that, whether free or interned, we desire a more normal sort of life than the one we have had to lead during the past year and a half with its constant interruptions and frequent sensations.

The Defence of India Act was placed on the Statute Book

as a war measure, pure and simple, and we have been given to understand that but for the war we would not have been deprived of our liberty. For our part, we have always repudiated every suggestion of any action of ours unauthorised by law and prejudicial to the defence of India or the public safety. But even if long after the outbreak of war it was really necessary to deprive us of our liberty, our release should have been ordered more than three months ago when hostilities had altogether ceased and no kind of public danger could have any longer been apprehended from our unfettered freedom. No public consideration can, I take leave to submit, justify our incarceration a moment longer, and the watchful justice of a righteous government should be a sure shield to guard every subject or citizen against every indication and effort of private and personal malice.

Apologising for the length of my letter, and trusting that the final decision of government will soon be announced.

57. To James DuBoulay*

Chhindwara
13 March 1919

I would invite your attention to my letter of the 18th February last in which I had requested you to let us know what, if any, decision had been arrived at by the Government of India on the report of the Committee appointed to investigate the case of our internment. I regret to have to say that not only has that letter not been so far answered, but that it has not even been acknowledged.

I am not unaware of the usual pre-occupations of Government; and I can well understand that at a time when the Inter-

*Home Poll. A, Proceedings, July 1919, No. 1 & K.W. NAI.

Allied Peace Conference is sitting in Paris[1], and the Reform Proposals are about to be presented to Parliament, and particularly when in India too legislation of a novel and grave nature is on the anvil, the Government of India must be unusually busy. But, I hope I may say without offence, that I wish I was equally convinced that the government realised the corroding cares of men unjustly deprived of their most cherished liberties and kept in suspense year after year, which offers of release, made and then withdrawn, and the appointment of committees of investigation and their inquiries and report only heighten and increase. In the letter to which I invite your attention I had explained in some detail how delay had unfortunately occurred at every stage of these protracted proceedings, and I think I was justified in hoping that a definite decision would be communicated to us within a reasonable and definite time.

That hope has, however, been belied, and it appears that matters are likely to remain in this indefinite state for an indefinite period. In fact, we have heard that the Secretary of State for India has expressed a desire that we should no longer remain interned, but be restored to full liberty, but that certain officials with whom we were not *personae gratae* for reasons wholly unconnected with the war would still wish to prolong our incarceration, and insist, for want of anything more reasonable to urge, that we should not be released so long as the Peace Conference continues to discuss the terms of peace and the treaty of peace remains unsigned. If this is true, we can only say that it is characteristic of people who would like to postpone our release as long as they can manage to find some plea for delay, no matter how unconnected with anything within our control, and now that the Russian debacle can no longer be made to serve their purpose, and the German menace is a thing of the past, the discussion of the terms of peace, in which every citizen of the Empire should be free to

1 The conference met in Paris in 1919. From its sessions and as a result of agreements made after its adjournment, five treaties were drawn : (1) the Treaty of Versailles with Germany, 28 June 1919 ; (2) the Treaty of Saint-German with Austria, 10 September 1919 ; (3) the Treaty of Trianon with Hungary, 6 June 1920 ; the Treaty of Sevres with Turkey, 10 August 1920. The Treaty of Lausanne (23 July 1923) modified the Treaty of Sevres.

participate, if Empire is to have any meaning and significance for good, is put forward as a plea for compelling us to remain tongue-tied. We trust these men will not be permitted to project personal malice into public considerations, and snatch a sort of victory a second time, and that we shall be released without further delay. Awaiting an early decision.[2]

2 At the insistence of H.D. Craik, the government communicated the proposed reply by William Vincent to questions asked by G.S. Khaparde regarding the cases of the Ali Brothers. The government refused to release the report of the Committee of Enquiry (submitted on 20 December 1918), but summed up its findings. The Committee concluded that the Government of India was "fully justified in imposing restrictions upon their liberty", adding that "the conduct of the brothers since their internment has been sufficient justification for the refusal to release them during the period of the war". The Committee, however, recommended the release of the brothers because "there is no longer occasion to apprehend that any views or activities of theirs can interfere with the relations between Great Britain and Turkey". This was not accepted by the Government of India.

58. To Syed Ross Masood[1]

Chhindwara
18 March 1919

For reasons which you may perhaps understand yourself without any indication from me, I never wrote to you all these

1 Syed Ross Masood (1889-1937), the grandson of Syed Ahmad Khan; was educated in New College, Oxford, where he obtained a bad second class in History which, he said, was more than he deserved; returned to India in February 1912 and elected trustee of Aligarh College on 26 January 1913; was an influential personage in Hyderabad as Director of Public Instruction and played a large part in the planning of Hyderabad's now Osmania University; appointed Vice-Chancellor of Aligarh Muslim University in 1929 but was outvoted in the University Court over the matter of a staff appointment in 1936; served as Minister of Education in Bhopal; died of kidney disease on 30 July 1937. His 'princely manners and good looks, the vividness and demonstrativeness, charmed and excited' E.M. Forster; 'and gradually...he fell in love with Masood'. 'There never was anyone like him', wrote Forster in his tribute, 'and there never will be anyone like him'.

years, though Aligarh affairs on one or two occasions tempted me very much to do so. Many of those reasons still remain, but the affairs of the dear old college, which you know I love as much as any other of its dutiful sons, and particularly one suggestion on which my opinion is asked compel me to break the silence of four long years and write to you at some length. But writing is at best a poor medium for the exchange of thoughts, and internment does not improve it, and I would ask you to keep in view these disadvantages and make allowances for my peculiar position.

Without beating about the bush let me say at the very outset that since the passing away of your revered grandfather, among whose devoted disciples I have always subscribed myself, and whose policy has never had a more ardent supporter no matter what may have been the particular current swaying the public view, I say since his passing away the affairs of Aligarh have been almost uniformly in a bad way, and this is chiefly because none of his successors reached his high level, and many who professed to follow him even slavishly only wronged his memory by importing their own personal desires into his national policy and by justifying their own unjustifiable weeknesses by shielding themselves behind his perfectly justifiable and grand opportunism. You know how much I have differed on principle from one prominent and zealous worker at Aligarh, and it will serve no purpose if I go over the old ground again, though I feel confident that the repetition of my views regarding his policy and work would be received by you with no less tolerance and perhaps with no less agreement now that you have for the last four years been intimately related to him. Why I mention him here is only because in my view his mistrust of the public of the rank and file, characteristic of his Tory inclinations has been the most prominent feature of the opposition that has retarded the fruition of the hopes of your grandfather and your hardly less great and, if anything, a shade more loveable father. His enormous energy and undoubted influence, added to the late Nawab Mohsinul Mulk's weakness—which I find so hard to refer to in view of his many amiable and great qualities—gave a wrong bias to the bowl soon after your grandfather passed away when it was found difficult to leave the direction of affairs to your father. These 9 long years which culminated in the strike of the students were so disastrous in my opinion

that it will take Aligarh many many years to recover from their effects. Nawab Viqarulmulk had an opportunity of bringing things back to the level of 1898 ; but the steady and persistent opposition that he had to encounter, and his good-natured but tactically bad decision to have no "party" of his own to neutralise that opposition resulted in the indecisive nature of his limited success. Nawab Ishak Khan came in as a "party" man and in his early years did not a little to undo the work that his predecessor had been able to accomplish, and the desultory fighting continued in which the constitution of the Board of Trustees which no sane man would dare to justify in these days if he is also honest—continued to give him undecisive victories until, as if by a miracle he experienced a remarkable "conversion" which has I hope given peace and rest to his departed soul. Hopes came to be entertained of your cousin, my namesake, and although some things that I have since heard have caused me considerable disappointment, I refuse to give up all hope.[2] In any case I have no one at present to displace him, and even if I may not take any personal responsibility for his actions by voting for him, (although it can at the worst be merely indirect) I consider it my duty as a lover of my old college and one of its governors and trustees to render him every assistance in my power to carry on his heavy work, and although he has been unjust enough to suspect us of personal opposition to him, he will not, God willing, find us lacking in the fullest support whenever he needs it in bringing the college back to the level of his and your grandfather's days.[3] Such counsel and advice as he cares to invite he will always have from us, and he may rest assure that no sort of rancour or malice would be permitted

2 This refers to S. Mohamed Ali, Honorary Secretary of the Aligarh College, who proposed the candidature of Ross Masood for Principalship on 28 April 1919.

3 His contender was Dr. Ziauddin who, after having completed his assignment with the Sadler Commission, joined the College as Professor of Mathematics. At the first meeting of the trustees forty-nine voted for Syed Ross Masood and only five for Ziauddin. But the Chairman, Shaikh Abdullah, declared the meeting adjourned. When the meeting was reconvened on 30 April under the chairmanship of Nawab Muzamilullah Khan the tide had turned against Ross Masood. The Nawab decided the issue by casting his vote in favour of Ziauddin who assumed charge on 1 June 1919.

to cross our path in dealing with him and his work and policy. The fear rather is that he may choose to rely upon a "party", and not desire discriminating support but obedience to that party's mandate which we could not conscientiously render. You may perhaps here detect an inconsistency and say I abhor his reliance on "party" and yet regret that one of his predecessors did not make one and rely on its support. I am not opposed to the party system, and consider it inevitable in certain circumstances, and what I oppose is the "party" that has waged a perpetual war against the liberalisation of the constitution of the college, chiefly because if once the people are invited to take any part in the administration of the college, beyond paying down hard cash and saying ditto to the local Mr. Burke and his followers, this party knows that it will be in a very small minority, which it desires to avoid at any cost to the college or the community. Now our opposition to this party and its tactics remains, and we foresee no possibility of a compromise. The college belongs to the community and can only be worked as a communal trust which the community must control in its broader aspects. The party opposed to this view cannot formulate its creed as opposed to ours; but its work betrays the faith or rather want of faith that has guided it at every turn. And the result is precisely what I had foretold. Since the administrators of the college disregarded the voice of the people and kept it as a close preserve of theirs with the help of the existing constitution which with its life tenure and co-option makes the position of our Tories, both sleeping and wide awake, impregnable, the only way in which the public could show its disapproval was to boycott the college, and this everyone must realise it has at last begun to do. This is the most alarming, but at the same time the most natural result of the disregard of public opinion. Every spring from which the life-giving financial current used to flow is now dried. Hardly anyone attends the Educational Conference that used to be the missionary of the college. And now the college which in 1911 had for want of accommodation to refuse admission to 500 odd applicants intending to join it, is now reduced to the pitiable alternative of having to close some of the hostels for want of applicants. Habib-ur-Rahman Khan Saheb wants to get the University at an early date and invites all to work for this consummation, and the *Institute Gazette* writes in support of the appeal. But the appeal ignores

the causes that have brought Aligarh to this pass, and the *Gazette* has the dishonesty or madness to condemn just those men that warned the powers that be againstt he sure and certain results of their blindly narrow and selfish policy, and knowing as it does only too well that so much is lost, and so much more is at stake, all because we had forsaken the Quran and the unmistakable Tradition of the Prophet, it yet pretends to believe that our salvation will come from alien and in fact hostile sources. Am I wrong then in fearing that these people, like the Bourbons of History, have learnt nothing and forgotten nothing, and all these terrible and bloody pages of recent history have been unfolded before their gaze to little purpose ? Were Aligarh less to us than it is, and were we prepared to tell all the good and great work of your grandfather and your father and their numerous friends and followers be undone, we would have given the thing up as hopeless, and washed our hands of it, being certain at least that the only triumph which the party in power would achieve would be that of finding the college chest empty but for the "benevolences" exacted from impotent potentates and moneyed tuft-hunters and toadies and the college itself deserted but for a few members of the latter's families. But the drowning catch at straws, and although you may say it is a doubtful compliment to you to compare you to a straw, my dear Masud, we are too near the heart of realities to indulge in vain complimenting, and if you still value an honest friend's opinion of you, you will find some satisfaction at least in the hope we are expressing that you may prove the straw that can sometimes assist the drowning and help the dear old college out of the current that is fast carrying it away towards the uncharted seas of utter chaos.

Your cousin Mohamed Ali has invited us to offer an opinion regarding your being asked to accept the post of the Principal, and although it is clear that you suffer financially by the change, none of us, not the most prodigal nor the most greedy would consider the change as a loss, and although you have been used to good living, I believe I know you too well to think for a minute that the loss of even 500 rupees a month would weigh with you even as much as a feather weight when the honour, and still more, the great responsibility, and the power of doing good, is given its proper weight. I imagine you have taken stock of the position at Aligarh, and that you are willing to take up the work, for though it may be a

damnosa hereditas to an extraneous, it can be nothing but the crowing glory of the life of a true son of the dear old college and of Sir Syed and Syed Mahmud. It is in this belief that we have both said Amen to your cousin's proposal.

But apart from this, we have a personal reason for rejoicing also, since it was these very exiles of Gondwana that had sent three years ago the proposal to free the hands of the Trustees from these no longer necessary and most humiliating and depressing shackles. Conceited as you know I am, and full of the most touching belief in my own capacity for benificence, you will forgive the want of modesty and accept the compliment, that since I cannot be the Principal of the College, I can think of no better man than yourself, and in spite of the misgivings of some, possibly on account of your relationship with the Secretary and Aftab and fears of a hereditary succession, possibly on account of your age and possibly also on account of the early influence on you of persons from whose efforts Aligarh has suffered not a little in their estimation,—I say in spite of all these misgivings only the last of which I share to some extent, we have straightaway written to your cousin that we vote confidently for you.

I seek no compensation for this, and cannot in the least bind you in your views and actions in the future, while such friendly counsel as I may have to give would have been given in any case, its measure being merely your willingness to receive it. But why I am inflicting this long screed on you is merely because I trust you not entirely ignore the lesson of experience that we have ever since 1902 tried to teach our comrades at Aligarh. Aligarh cannot be run on lines divorced from Islam and respect for the community's opinion, and Muslims, and they alone can lay down its policy. Once Principal you will be precluded from laying down that policy directly, for you will no longer be a governor and trustee. But you will have enormous indirect influence in moulding our views, and since we cannot apprehend from you any hostility either to our interests or traditions, but can be confident of the most loyal acceptance of the broad features of our policy—an inheritance from your own sire and grandsire—we could work for the college by day with all our might, and sleep soundly of nights, in the full assurance that we had nothing to fear after the day's work had been conscientiously

done. With the friction of the last 20 years removed, what a relief would we not feel. It is this assurance that makes us rejoice in advance. As for you, you will realise perhaps for the first time after your return from England what a fine lot at least our boys are, and though possibly there may linger for a time the after effects of the *ancien regime*, some of the ragged edge after all the skirmishing of these two decades, they will soon realise what a difference real love means, and you will realise perhaps still sooner what an antidote love provides for the poison of indiscipline and mistrust. We have worked in the interests of the college and in close touch with them for so many years, and I would like to say now behind the backs of these boys that I do not want my own children to show me more reverence than what these boys have invariably shown to us in spite of all our familiarity which is supposed to breed contempt.

Since the policy of the trustees will not be directly affected by you any longer, I need say nothing about it. But I do hope your indirect influence would always be exerted in the direction of giving more dignity, more self-respect, and more self-confidence to the trustees and their executive, and of keeping the college of the community clearly marked off from colleges not its own. Finally, I look forward to an improvement in the religious tone of the college—not a reversion to some old model of twenty or thirty years ago, but to the model of 1300 years ago when every human and God-given faculty was developed to its utmost capacity without let or hindrance, but all for the service of God and his creatures, and was regulated with reference to one Divine purpose—the glory of Islam. I am no religious to ask for any dry and sterile formalism beyond the necessary requirement of prayers and fasts, and my conception of Islam is as broad as Nature—the word that brought so much trouble to your grandfather. But if we have done little else, we have at least done this, my dear Mas'ud, that nobody can taunt us "Naturies" as Infidels. We have brought the Ulama and the "Naturies" together and not even Deoband can accuse us of want of faith or neglect of the responsibilities that a confession of faith brought in its train. What a sweet revenge, as President Wilson would say.

Well, I have tried you enough with my lay sermon, and must now desist. Do you remember a few womanish drops

that I could not suppress when I welcomed you back home from England in the Old Boys' Re-union ? I am glad I shall not be there to play the woman with mine eyes the day you come into your own little kingdom at Aligarh. But two distant exiles would be there with you in spirit to rejoice over your coronation. Take that as our tribute to yourself and to the grandfather and father to whose work and worth we owe so much. Shaukat sends you his love and so do I. Perhaps you will permit some of it to enter the cool penetralia of the Harem and the lady Venus would also accept it in spite of the wrath of her sire.

59. From Raza Ali

2 English Road
Allahabad
24 March 1919

I am sure you would like to know something about Moradabad. Masud[1] amd Yakub[2] were—and I hope still are—such good friends. Yet they are quarrelling over Municipal chairmanship.[3] The office is not Yakub's heritage and Masud is equally competent for it. But the worst of it is that

1 Masud-ul-Hasan (d. 1937) was a lawyer of Moradabad and a strong personal rival of Mohammad Yaqub in the municipal politics of the city. He was chairman of the Moradabad municipal board from 1919-23; later he became chief minister of Rampur State.

2 Mohammad Yaqub (b. 1879) was a leading lawyer of Moradabad and a prominent figure in Muslim League politics. He was a member of the Moradabad municipal board and its first non-official chairman; President, Muslim League, 1920; member, Age of Consent Committee (1928) and the Indian Franchise Committee, 1932; President, legislative assembly, 1930. In 1913, he was elected trustee of Aligarh College and was a member of the University Court.

3 In Moradabad city Muslims represented nearly sixty per cent of the population and dominated the municipal bodies until the end of the nineteenth century. The introduction of 1900 Municipalities Act, however destroyed the Muslim majority. The Moradabad municipal board remained at the centre of the most bitter communal controversies.

unknown to Yakub, Masud has been preparing for the election for months past. He never spoke to Yakub about it and aided by Moazzam Ali proclaimed his own candidature openly— and that too in an unbecoming manner. I was at Moradabad at the time (8th and 9th instant) and did my best to effect a reconciliation. But I am so sorry that I failed. My sympathies are with Yakub for the sole reason that Masud has cheated him. Both of them are among my best friends and to me it does not very much matter who wins. But the results will be disastrous. Moradabad was the only place in these Provinces where everything was in the hands of the Young Party. What I dread is that the present contest will create a split which will divide the advanced party into two sections. And you know that when men sever connection with old friends they do not hesitate to embrace Shafi and Nawab Ali. The Congress split is a case in point.

The Election at Moradabad takes place about the 3rd or 4th April. You can prevent the split if you are so inclined. I am telling you what the situation there is. I shall most probably be at Moradabad on 29th or 30th instant.

60. From Abdur Rahman Siddiqi

Delhi
24 March 1919

I don't know why I delayed answering your long and interesting letter. The chief reason perhaps was that I was myself absolutely undecided as to what I should write to you and the other reason was that I was translating a book from Urdu into English for Mohammad Amin of Bhopal in which I hope to get some money and thus get rid of a huge debt hanging over my head from the days of the mission to Turkey. I was working at the translation night and day and sometimes even did it in my dreams also. It is over now. Shuaib is revising it and thus I have got time for a chat with you.

What will Shuaib and I do is a matter very difficult to decide. There was the Sultania College for all these years

but dear old Bijnori has taken it with himself into the grave and the Prince has perhaps given it the final push. We were still thinking over it when Hasrat dropped in and began to compel us to go to England. I thought that financial reasons may desist him but he was ready with an answer for that too. Hasrat has got money or has cent per cent hopes for getting it. The matter was put to Ansari and others with the result that our names were proposed and we were elected. There can be only two reasons that can come in our way now. Either Col. Beadon by refusing the passport or Hasrat by not bringing the cheque. I am not very hopeful of either. Let us see. So far as I am concerned I shall not be sorry if I do not go.

Then comes in the other and a most generous offer. The behaviour of the Sultania College Committee has not been very laudable for some time past and Ansari has been feeling rather cut up over it. The result is that he offers to give me and Shuaib Rs 5000. Rahman had saved Rs 5000 for a motor and he places this amount too at our disposal. When this talk was going on Hakim Sahib came forward and said that if he was not included he would have a serious grievance against all of us. He says he can pay Rs 200 a month easily. We shall get concessions of same terms at Oxford or Cambridge and at the Inns of Court and these England-returned here think that the amount will do. In case we feel the pinch about the end there are Shuaib's lands. They can fetch at the least 5 or 6 thousand.

These are the proposals and these the plans today. We are both not very mad now over the pleasure of being called England-returned but Ansari feels that our usefulness becomes greater if we have had experience of life in England. I agree with him there. But it is all in a liquid condition still and will become solid only when the passports are in our hands and Hasrat's cheque.

If we do not go to England then what do we do? I am puzzled over it and cannot come to any decision. I think both of us have rolled enough and remained the same stones. Moss has been gathered but of the withering type which does not pay. We *must* get settled soon otherwise we are lost for ever and ever. There is a thing called *wonder-lust* and there can be a thing called *chutia-lust* and let me assure you that the latter is of the more dangerous and virulent quality. How

long can we go on at the game of eating other people's bread and even wearing other peoples clothes. It is now the breaking point.

You are not going to be released till the German Emperor and Dr. Wilson have kissed each other and wept over each others' shoulders. That is what Gandhi was told when he was here last. It is silly decision but it is William Wilson's (and there is a good deal of the mailed fist and the nailed boot of the other William in it). DuBoulay was full of praises for you. It is a question of *Roshini Tbah*. They cannot afford to take the risk of liberating you because you are a person that is likely to swallow up all the secretariats of Simla and Delhi at one gulp. How absurd.

Ghate's letter of Gandhi I have seen and I am not much in agreement with it as Shaukat must have informed you. Gandhi is a Tolstoy and Buddha combined but I have developed a sort of feeling about him. You of course know that I was educated at Ahmedabad from my 2nd to the matric class and I feel so much of the...[Illegible] about him. Well but perhaps I am wrong and I do hope I am wrong. I have not signed the Satyagraha vow for several reasons—mind you there may be the *Porus ka Haathi* in it, but one of them was that I cannot put full faith in the leadership of the Mahatma.

Mrs. Mohamed Ali and the kids were here and are quite well.

Love to Shaukat and yourself from Shuaib and myself. Remember us to Ghate also.

61. From Syed Ross Masood

Hyderabad Dn
25 March 1919

Many thanks for your typed letter of the 18th which I received last night. No letter that I have ever received has moved me so much. This state of my mind will be easily understood by you when I tell you that I had been informed by a number of your friends with whom you had been corresponding that you

had blackguarded me in your letters to them. Now no one who dislikes me can ever write an affectionate letter like the one you have just sent me. Indeed it does my heart good to see peeping out of the letter the old Mohamed Ali I knew so well. Both of us, my dear fellow, have passed through extra ordinary experiences—yours have been nerve-shattering and mine soul-killing. All mine will be told to you when God allows us to meet. Personally I am becoming very pessimistic about my community. My conclusions are based on purely intellectual and social considerations. The paths you and I have chosen are so entirely different and our experiences so extraordinarily varied that I cannot possibly expect our conclusions as regards the future of the community to be the same.

Now to come to the real matter discussed in your letter I must tell you at the very outset that it has done me a world of good to receive this very frank and affectionate epistle from you. It has given me a new courage to continue facing the numerous difficulties which beset me in my own limited sphere of life.

Before I go more deeply into things I must ask you to recollect a certain long and impassioned discussion that we had in Delhi one evening when we were having a dinner in the Qudsia Gardens. My ideals as regards my duty to my community and country as expressed to you then have ever remained unaltered. I have stuck to education and hope to end my life in trying to do what little I can to improve it and make it more rational; and in this I pray God to help me. Aligarh—the idol to which both of us are devoted is as you rightly say lying in a most precarious condition. The most earnest of endeavours is necessary to save it from impending annihilation. I assure you my dear Mohamed Ali that all that you have heard about my cousin being a party man is a damned lie, and I know that you know me well enough to realise that I would never make so solemn a declaration if I had the slightest doubt about it. My cousin is one of the most honest and straightforward of men that it has ever been my lot to meet and I implore you not to allow your much-tried mind to be poisoned by the numerous false reports which are no doubt communicated to you. Your fine determination as expressed in your letter to trust him and to help him in the

arduous task that lies before him makes me love you a thousand times more. In this you have not only fulfilled my hopes but have done much more and I cannot tell you how extremely happy I feel about it.

My own position as regards the principalship has become extraordinarily painful from every point of view. It has made me realise what a very much disliked person I am. Dr. Ziauddin has, I believe, openly declared that though he does not mind working under an European he will resign if the Trustees appoint me or any other Indian. You know very well, my dear fellow, that I never applied for the post. Moreover this attitude of a man who only a few months before had sent in his resignation together with the other European professors is most puzzling—it is a mystery that poor brain will never solve. The truth of the matter is that when the English professors of the College had resigned and I had delivered the so-called fiery speech cursing their rude attitude my name was suggested by a number of trustees and I was actually implored by them to give up everything and come to Aligarh. A few weeks later these very gentlemen whose names common decency forbids me to mention changed their minds and began to put forward Ziauddin as the best man for the job. As if this were not enough the whole affair was allowed to get into the papers and very considerable injury was done to me. Personally however I have remained absolutely silent and will continue to do so till I am formally approached in the matter. I am as you know prepared to undergo any sacrifice that is demanded of me in the interest of the College—the only legacy that has been left to me. What is extremely distressing, however, is the fact that I have been made to play the part of a rival candidate in this extraordinary business. I positively hate the idea of being looked upon as a rival of Dr. Ziauddin and find my position both painful and ludicrous. Had my parents left me enough money to keep me alive and to ensure a sound education for my children I would have devoted all my mental and physical energies to the College. The very idea that I have to accept a salary from the very institution to which my people gave their all is both galling and humiliating and makes me shrink from it. The very conception is so abominably inartistic. But I have absolutely no alternative if the post is offered to me.

As regards my ideals in connection with what should be done to improve the college I enumerate them below for your perusal :

1. Introduction of a spirit of frankness as regards the treatment of the students.

2. Higher ideals of life.

3. The creation of true academic spirit by encouraging intellectual liberty.

4. A genuine improvement in games and methods of work.

5. The enforcement of rational discipline.

6. Closer cooperation all round.

These are the six main things I have before me. I want the students of our college to be frank and self-respecting. All that tends to cramp sound development must be ruthlessly brushed aside, no shams to be allowed. It is impossible for me to give you in a letter all the details as regards the various methods by which these aims can be achieved, so let the bare headings suffice.

62. Interview with Mohamed Ali*

25 March 1919

At Chhindwara yesterday I saw the Ali Brothers, who asked me for an interview, and I wish to write and tell you the result.

Shaukat Ali is as cock-a-hoop and bouncing as ever. But Mohamed Ali appeared to be in a very chastened frame of mind and almost broke down during the interview. Although I did not discuss the matter with him, he has no doubt felt the downfall of Turkey. And one of the local officers told me that Mohamed Ali felt that he lost much of his influence, and that he (the officer) believed he was not sorry to be left at Chhindwara for the present. Both the internees had two requests to make :

*Home Poll. A, July 1919, I & K.W, NAI. These impressions of Benjamin Robertson were communicated to William Vincent, the Home Member, on 25 March 1919.

1. That they should have some information as to the result of proceedings of the committee of investigation into their case. They wanted to know what were the committee's findings respecting the charges framed, and also what was the decision of the Government of India on the findings. I promised to transmit this request to the Government of India. Personally I consider that informations on the subject should be given them.

2. That they should have their allowances increased. Shaukat Ali talked volubly about the wrong that was done to them by destroying their business. If government found it necessary to intern them as a precautionary measure, that was one thing ; but to inflict on them heavy financial loss by the closing of their Rampur Cotton Press and of Mohamed Ali's printing business was another. Mohamed Ali chimed in by saying that before this internment he was making Rs 1,500 a month from his papers and another Rs 750 from writing for the Press, and that his printing press was now rusting and had greatly depreciated in value. I told them that all I was prepared to do was to represent anything they wished said about their existing allowances. This question has, as you know, been recently raised, and Slocock wrote to DuBoulay that I had no recommendation to make. In sending this reply my position was that Rs 800, which is the present payment they receive, was sufficient for them to live in moderate comfort at Chhindwara and as the Government of India knew their social position and standing better than I did and had twice raised their allowance, it might be left to the latter to say whether anything further should be given to the internees.

The brothers represent especially that on their present allowances they cannot educate their children properly. Shaukat Ali says he has three sons aged 18, 17 and 12 years. Only the first of these is at Aligarh ; he wants to send the other two, but cannot afford to do so, and they have to be kept at Rampur or Chhindwara. He has also two daughters, who are at Rampur and have to be supported. Mohamed Ali has four daughters all of whom, I think except one who is a child, want education. They both also strongly pressed for reconsideration of their allowances on the ground of the prevailing high prices, and said they could no longer afford to buy decent clothes. I may state by the way that both were very dandily dressed when they saw me—although Mohamed

Ali said his garments were four years old—white Astrakhan Fezzes with a crescent in the centre, well out lounge coats with a large yellow crescent on the breast pocket, and a metal badge surmounted by a crescent in their button-holes ! Undoubtedly their payments do not go far as they did with the prevailing high prices, and like everybody else on fixed pay they feel the pinch of the latter.

Still as I have said, Rs 800—their joint income—is not unreasonable for their existence at Chhindwara. But if their story about the education of their children is correct, I think that this ought to be further provided for. As for the prices, this has been to some extent already discounted by past enhancements of their payments. My own view is that it would be advisable to let them have a further rise so as to give them as little cause as possible for complaining of harsh treatment when they come out, as I presume they will presently do. As I have already said, the Government of India know more about their standing than I do, but I should be inclined to put their joint payment (inclusive of Shaukat Ali's pension) upto at least Rs 1000.

Mohamed Ali's diabetes has greatly benefited by his stay at Chhindwara and he is much better as regards that complaint. He says, however, that he has now got dysentery and finds it necessary to fast for two days in the week. The civil surgeon, Major Windross, who attends them, told me that this was a new development, as he had only heard of it that morning. But, as I have said, Mohamed Ali seemed far from cheerful and had none of Shaukat Ali's swagger and bravado.

63. To Moazzam Ali

Chhindwara
27 March 1919

I haven't had a single letter from you or Amy or the girls, and do not know whether and when they are coming. You can imagine life cannot be a very pleasant affair here just now since there is nothing but waiting, waiting, waiting. Three days ago a slight diversion occurred inasmuch as we called on

the Chief Commissioner, who stayed about 20 hours here while going to the summer headquarters of the Administration ta Pachmari.

After a few preliminary questions that he asked about Shaukat's last visit to Rampur and the arrangements made about his factory, we came to the main question and asked him when we were going to be released. He said he knew nothing about it, and must frankly say he had himself nothing against us, being merely our gaoler, so to speak, since the Government of India had chosen to send us to him. He was a Post Office and merely communicated their orders to us and our representations to them, and had told all his officers that they were not to worry us, and that, on the contrary, they should try to make our stay as comfortable as possible. In this respect he understood we had recently had no complaint to make, though he admitted Chhindwara had had a series of misfortunes as regards the Deputy Commissioners it had had in such quick succession. One had died and another he had to suspend. Although that man was far too insignificant for any serious notice, I did wish Ishtiaq Ali had been present to hear his Chief Commissioner repeat the instructions he had given to his officers about their behaviour towards us. Do you remember how he used to tell every man here that none was to visit us or have any intercourse with us, because every one who did this had his name sent up to the Inspector-General of Police and he was sure to be punished—perhaps by a Court Martial—*after* the war! One Muslim family was actually threatened and has never recovered since ; but the others were not thus deceived, and when Mathias, one of my contemporaries at Oxford, was here, I was compelled to hand over to him the great 'Chhote Sahib', as this 'lordling' was called here, and this petty terrorising of a man who was the personification of 'Funk' where his superior officers were concerned, came somewhat abruptly to an end much to the relief, not unmixed with amusement, of the long suffering people of this good, quiet place. Mathias came to see us and assured us that if we would let bygones be bygones he could guarantee that we should have no reason to complain thereafter. The Chief Commissioner had also to acknowledge that during the 7 months that Batchelor was the Deputy Commissioner we had been treated badly; but he asked us, like Mathias, to let bygones be bygones. "Jo hua so hua" ; and we also agreed,

considering that the poor devil has been forcibly retired on a much smaller pension than what as an I.C.S. man he expected to live on at the end of his service. As I have probably already told you, I found in the course of one or two subsequent visits which the urgency of the business in hand compelled me to pay to him—the only ones either of us ever paid—and several quite chatty conversations when we met in the town, the man is not habitually a "Bahadar" and discourteous to Indians in general and the detenus in particular, but fearfully eccentric, like many a mathematician, and the reason why he had been such a nuisance to us was that probably he regarded all work other than engineering, on which he was unduly keen, as a nuisance ; and since evidently he had not bargained for having to deal with interned persons as the censor of their correspondence, and now found that such attention as he was compelled to pay to their correspondence interfered with his engineering scheme of the Sillevani Ghat waterfall for generating power, he came to regard us also as a nuisance. And knowing only one way of dealing with unpleasant things in life he tried to assert authority where it happened that even the Defence of India Act had, in a fit of absent-mindedness forgotten to give him any authority. He tried to outdo even Ishtiaq Ali, but found that even the good quiet people of Chhindwara would not stand any longer such high-handed action as interference with people's private and social affairs. It was most amusing to hear from one of these the account of a recent conversation he had had and the total change in his "angle of vision". But since the man has met with misfortune, and blundered only because his head was by some mistake screwed on to the body of a district officer instead of an engineer, it is best to say with the Chief Commissioner, "Jo hua so hua".

Reverting to the question of our internment, the Chief Commissioner asked us if we had received no information about the Committee's investigation and its result, and expressed considerable surprise when he learnt that we had not, and entirely agreed that the least that should have been done was to acquaint us with the report of the Committee and a definite decision of the Government of India thereon. He said he had not a word to say against us for all the years we had been here, and amply confirmed what he had asked a local officer here to communicate to us when he passed

Chhindwara on the last occasion. He expressed himself in such a straightforward and unhesitating and unreserved manner about his own position, his instructions to his subordinates about us and his complete satisfaction with our behaviour that we were greatly impressed ; and we think he too was equally greatly impressed with the straightforward, unhesitating and unreserved manner in which we referred to our own position. Finally he promised that he would take up the matter when he met the Viceroy next Sunday, probably when the Viceroy returns through the C.P. from his visit to the Nizam. He was emphatic in his declaration that one way or the other we should definitely be told what the Committee had found and what the Government of India had decided thereon, and that the present suspense was wholly indefensible and unjust.

As regards the financial question, Shaukat and I explained that our normal profits in business would have been between Rs 25,000 to Rs 30,000 a year ; that if, as the Government claimed, our internment was merely a precautionary and not a punitive measure, we should have been provided with funds equal to these legitimate and reasonably expected profits ; that far from doing that Government declined even to shoulder the responsibility for Rs 15,000 per annum, the unavoidable out-of-pocket expenses for the two concerns, wrongly confusing them with "business losses" ; and that the allowance fixed for our subsistence, far from providing us with resources wherefrom to meet these expenses, did not suffice even for our subsistence and the expenses connected with our children's education, so that we spent something like Rs 10,000 derived from other sources such as the sale of jagir, and—when all these had been exhausted—borrowed up to date something like Rs 4,000 from friends and others, in order to supplement our allowances for the unavoidable monthly expenses during the last 4 years of our internment, even though we had lowered our standard of living and had all but stopped all expenditure on the children's education. I have just calculated and found that while the Government deprived each of us in the last four years of something like a lakh and quarter which we reasonably expected to earn as net profits—I was earning even then without the *Comrade* Rs 2,250 a month, and the circulation of the *Hamdard*, then about 9,000 was going up regularly, so that Rs 30,000 a year is a conservative estimate of my probable

annual income—we were jointly saddled with responsibility for Rs 60,000 for interest on borrowed capital and establishment and cleaning and rent charges, and thus made to suffer to the extent of over 3 lakhs of rupees, getting in return merely Rs 27,500 for both of us, including about Rs 7,000 which Shaukat received as his pension after 17 years of meritorious service and would have got in any case. If the pension is excluded, we got only about Rs 20,000 in these 46 months. On an average we got no more than Rs 300 each, including Shaukat's pension of Rs 150. This was supplemented by something like Rs 14,000 being the sale proceeds of our jagir and other things and laterly loans as yet not repaid. This works out at about Rs 300 a month more for the two of us. Thus we after all spent no more than Rs 450 a month, and you know how far below our standard of living this figure is, and how difficult you find to live even within an amount higher than that by a good hundred (although, dear old Moazzam, you are as sterile as a mule and have no children). Our claim is that at least Rs 60,000 we are saddled with merely on account of our internment and the consequent closure of our business, while interest etc. went on accruing merrily, should be paid by Government; that the excess of Rs 14,000 spent on ourselves owing to the meagre internment allowances during the last 4 years should be paid by Government practically as "back pay"; and finally that so long as we are interned at least Rs 500 must be paid to each of us every month though the present level of prices makes that no better than Rs 300 before.

If Clive could be astonished at his own moderation at the fortune he amassed here, surely we have a right to be astounded at ours. We "undersell" even Surrendra Babu and see—why?—Chintamani. The Chief Commissioner said he had known nothing about us beyond this that I was an Oxford man, and he wrote to the Government of India that I could not be expected to live on Rs 250 a month with a wife and 4 children, besides other dependents, and that's why we got a collective increase of Rs 100 a month which either Oxford could retain for itself in its entirety or share with Aligarh.

This is indeed news, and Oxford really proved to be an Alma Mater literally. Of course I had shared the increase with Shaukat, and I told the Chief Commissioner that were it not for his courageous or rather audacious generosity I would never have received the benefit of an Oxford education. As it

was his income always exceeded mine and so did his expenditure. Well, the increase sanctioned after 18½ months of internment itself implied that our expenses must have been higher, and I told the Chief Commissioner that at first I fought merely on principle for an allowance being fixed, and was indifferent to the amount so long as *The Hamdard* lived and flourished ; but that after a year's hard struggle to do without asking for an increased allowance even after the strangulation of my paper by Hailey with such cool calculation, I was forced to apply for an increase, and I made it clear the very day an additional Rs 100 was sanctioned that the least we wanted was Rs 500 for each. After 18½ months our allowances had been raised to Rs 300 for each, and after another cycle of 18½ months practically they were raised to Rs 400 for each. But our expenditure was about Rs 500 a month for each all along, and the present level of prices made it difficult to live even with that amount. The main difficulty was as regards the education of our children, and Shaukat said only one of his boys could be sent to school, and he alone cost him Rs 60 a month. He had two others to send and two daughters besides to bring up. I told him I used to spend about Rs 130 a month on a European governess and Rs 30 on an Indian governess for my two elder girls before my internment. All that was out of the question now, but they had to be educated and fed and clothed, and they were now 17 and 16 and each cost as much as my wife—I did not let the Chief Commissioner know that 'Fatty' took five yards of cloth where her mother took only two : Then there were two others who cost so little when they were 2½ and 4½, but cost so much more when they are 6½ and 8½ respectively. The Chief Commissioner took down particulars about our children and rightly admitted that there should have been a proper inquiry before so small an allowance was fixed. He would put the matter before the Government of India now, though the other day he had forwarded our representation without any recommendation. Finally I told him that we had heard that the S. of S. had desired our release, but that those that had for personal reasons brought our internment about again came in the way and wanted to put off the evil day and prolong our torture as long as possible. I said I had no doubt that public considerations had little to do with our captivity, and everything, from the debacle of the Russians and the sitting of the Peace Conference down to

the discussion on the Rowlatt Bills was brought forward to urge delay. Perhaps failing everything these people will next ask the Germans to resume fighting. I assured him that the... *[Illegible]* were merely vexatious he could take my word for it that they could not interfere in the least with the hatching of conspiracies far more to mind it. At this he laughed heartily. But we had represented all this only too often. The question now was this. If the safety of the State necessitated the sacrifice of our liberty, it was obvious a thing of sufficient value ; and if that would reasonably have earned. Deprivation of profits to the extent of two and a half lakhs, coupled with saddling us with Rs 60,000 out-of-pocket expenses was bad enough. But how is one to characterise this process of slow starvation ? I told him I had not spent a pie on my clothes beyond buying some socks at the rate of As 6 a pair ! But I had to see that my wife and children had decent clothes, at least clean linen if not the silk to which they were all along used. If the State for its safety took it into its head to demand to sacrifice our liberty, it had already extracted that sacrifice. But why did it want our financial ruin ? And did it hope to make us whine and to break down our fortitude in face of unmerited suffering by worrying us with daily want ?

The Chief Commissioner has promised to refer the matter to the Viceroy whom he meets in a couple of days. Well, we can only say, with discredited old Asquith, "wait and see".

Now I will say goodbye for the present. It is everywhere "Wait and See". I suppose the same is true of Amy's coming and the children's. Also yours ? At least that is true of our future and of our future plans. Oh the weary watching and wearier waiting ! Our only consolation is the poet's just estimate :

"They also work who only stand and wait."

Love from both of us to yourself, Safir and the boys. By the way, you agreed to accept payment for all schemes with regard to Mahmud and you can't back out now. For if you do, I shall have to spend a lot more and send the boy to Aligarh. Don't I get enough out of you, you old Buck, that you should pay for the boy's food ? If you think I don't saddle you with enough financial weight, then just wait till I send you to gaol.

64. From Motilal Ghose[1]

Amrita Bazar Patrika Office
14 April 1919

Your lovely and delicious letter was received duly. Please excuse delay in replying to it and excuse also the help of an amanuensis, for I can scribble only illegible scrawls and that through the pencil. Surely it is not at all proper for me to throw on you the infliction of deciphering them. Your letter is sweeter than the *Sandesh* I love so much, nay even the Rasogollah which makes your mouth water. I have never seen or corresponded with you two brothers. Why then this strong attraction for you ? If I were a believer in a previous birth, which I am not, I could account for it. For, in that case I would say that I was perhaps your grandfather and you were my grandsons. Indeed, I have something like a grandfather's affection for you. I have got three grandsons—my good son-in-law, who is now in Heaven has left them behind for the consolation of myself, my daughter and my wife. Two of them are graduates, aged 27 and 21, respectively and the third is in college. Have I the privilege of adding you two to the list, so that I may be the proud possessor of nearly half-a-dozen grandchildren, quite a respectable number—is it not ?

Grandpa is nearly 72 and therefore an old fossil. If he had any brains they have well nigh been congealed and hardened into a lump of block. If his head is now come in violent contact with the blow of a thick club possibly the club and not the head will break. Garrulity is one of the chief characteristics of old age. So don't be surprised if I ramble pointlessly. First of all let me know how can you be so full of fun though your body has been kept enchained these four years or more ? This only proves the truth of the philosophy that soul force can snap its fingers at brute force. And how is it that you are yet so cheerful though so many severe calamities have befallen

1 1847-1922 ; a leading journalist of Bengal ; editor of *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, an English Daily published from February 1891 onwards; played an active part in the agitation against the partition of Bengal ; supported the 'extremists' after the 'Surat Split' in 1907 ; joined the Home Rule League in 1918 and played a prominent part in the agitation against the Rowlatt Act.

you in rapid succession ? This shows that you have a firm faith in God who can never do wrong—more correctly speaking, the more He punishes us (punishes according to our light) the more we ought to see His love for us. His punishment is really a blessing though we may wince under it. We forget Him in our prosperity but we have to look up to him frequently in our adversity. Talking of love—is He not the fountainhead from whom the mother gets only a drop and becomes so irresistibly sweet and beautiful. Infinitely sweeter and more beautiful must be He who created the mother and endowed her with His celestial love.

As regards mother I know you are blessed with one of whom you may well be proud. I also know that but for her spiritual strength you would have to pine away in your prison house. I had a mother too. She was named Amrita (Eveetar) and nectar she was from the sole of her foot to the top of her head. And what a glorious ascension she had ! You have no doubt heard of my illustrious elder brother Shishir Kumar. Like you two brothers we had also two bodies with one soul. He was the Sun and I the Moon—he was the substance and I only his shadow. We have been separated these ten years, but he makes me feel his presence frequently. If I had not the firm conviction that I would meet him and other dear ones in the next world I would have gone mad or committed suicide. It is this conviction which enabled me to bear up my recent bereavement, one of the heaviest that it has been my lot to suffer.

I don't know if I can talk politics with you so long you are in internment, though there is nothing wicked in the political views which you and I entertain. Good cometh out of evil. Though the Rowlatt Act sits like a dread nightmare on our breasts it has united both Hindus and Muslims in a way which has never been witnessed. Is it not a miracle that Hindus should preach in the Masjid and Muslims should enter Hindu temples.[2] Pity that the policy of "Divide and Rule" has yet its sway over a number of our educated men, specially those who were once people's representatives. This

2 The reference is to Swami Shradhanand who was invited to deliver the Friday *khutba* (Sermon) at the Juma Masjid in Delhi. He was also asked to speak at the Fatehpuri mosque.

lack of strength to resist bureaucratic blandishment or bait has ever been the curse of this country. Alas ! when will our people fully realise the fact that unity is strength and disunion the road to ruin ?

I hope you are getting the *Rasogollah* regularly. Possibly it is not now such a good luscious thing as it was, say, ten years ago. This must be so; for, as stated above grandpapa is deteriorating mentally and physically and times are more hard now. If you have the privilege of sending innocent things for publication over your name do send them now and then. You have an inimitable way of writing. If possible the public should not be deprived of enjoying it. I am tempted to publish your letter to me, omitting personal matters ; but I can't do it without your permission.

P.S : After I had finished the letter I came to know with deep regret that the Government has refused to release you. May God protect you. Try to develop your soul power in your seclusion.

65. To Chelmsford*

Chhindwara
24 April 1919

We have now after repeated representations received a communication in which Government has embodied the findings of the Committee appointed by it in September 1918, to

*Home Poll. A, Proceedings, July 1919, No. 1 and K.W., NAI. According to W.S. Marris, 'I think that the memorial, offensive as it is, might be formally acknowledged by the Private Secretary as Mohamed Ali has complained of non-acknowledgement in the past. But no other reply seems possible to him personally'. This was accepted. On 12 May, D.G. Mackenzie, Assistant Private Secretary to the Viceroy, acknowledged receipt of the communication.

inquire into the case of our internment, and also the decision of Government rejecting the Committee's recommendation.[1]

From a Committee so unfairly constituted, and an investigation conducted with such utter disregard of all civilised judicial procedure, no one, and least of all we, who had protested against both at the very outset, could have expected anything better. Nor could any one acquainted with the inner history of our internment when it was ordered four years ago, and knowing how, under the existing system of administration, private caprice so often parades itself in the garb of public considerations, have any occasion for surprise in the fact that, even after the Committee's advice urging our release, Government should decline to restore us to liberty.

Since no method has yet been discovered of assessing the value of personal freedom, it is not possible for us to communicate to another an exact idea of what we lost when we lost our liberty. Nor is it possible for others to gauge the mental anguish we have endured in four years of exile, or the cumulative effect of the daily vexations of a detenu's life. The only form of loss that is capable of any precise indication is monetary ; and when it is understood that one result of our internment, and that the least serious, was that we were made to sustain the loss of two and a half lakhs of rupees in the last four years, some idea may be formed of the punitive character of a measure for which it has repeatedly been claimed on behalf of Government that it is purely precautionary.

Incidentally, government's dealings with us in these matters provide a fair enough test for judging whether our internment was due solely to public considerations. It is conceivable that public safety may need the restriction of a man's freedom in times of great stress and imminent danger to the State. But it could not conceivably need his financial ruin. To have deprived us of our liberty without just cause, and even without the semblance of an inquiry, was bad enough. But to have knowingly worried us with daily want, and to have forced our children, in spite of our repeated remonstrances, to grow

1 The Government of India had strong objections to this memorial, including the 'highly intemperate language' used by the Ali Brothers regarding their treatment by the Government of India and the British government's attitude to Muslim views on the Turkish peace terms.

up almost in ignorance for want of funds where with to educate them, was worse. One may attempt, if he so desires, to reconcile tyranny with public considerations; but meanness goes well only with malice.

However, the loss of one's business and the resulting privations may be borne along with the more grievous loss of personal liberty ; and we may well console ourselves for all the disabilities and discomforts that we have patiently borne all these years with the reflection that neither we nor our fellow-countrymen need be ashamed of our conduct during our prolonged internment. But no government was expected in the twentieth century to claim, even by implication, the right to force a man's conscience. And yet it is only on this hypothesis that this action of government with respect to the internment of Muslim *Ulama* and public workers, and the virtual suppression of the entire Muslim Press, culminating in the forfeiture of Dr. Ansari's Address, becomes intelligible.[2]

As for ourselves, there was at one time much talk of the discovery of some treasonable correspondence of ours with His late Majesty the Amir of Afghanistan, and with our spiritual preceptor, Maulana Abdul Bari Saheb of the House of Firangi Mahal, Lucknow, just when our release seemed to be in sight. But when immediately on hearing of it we openly challenged Government to produce those letters, this talk came very soon to subside. When a year later a statement of the reasons for our internment and for the refusal to release us was furnished to us, this preposterous accusation did not make its appearance at all. But this alone could not satisfy us Unwilling to tolerate any longer a constant shifting of the ground on the part of our accusers, we demanded from the Committee of Inquiry when it came here to examine us a searching investigation into the matter, so that one lie at least might be nailed to the counter. But all the satisfaction that we could obtain was the information that, in spite of an abundance of vague and undefined charges, not a word had been mentioned before the Committee on the subject of so grave and definite an accusation. Nevertheless, we pressed our demand for an inquiry

2 This refers to the opening speech of Dr. Ansari at the annual session of the Muslim League in December 1918. For the text of the speech, see Mushirul Hasan (ed.), *Muslims and the Congress : Select Correspondence of Dr. M A. Ansari, 1912-1935.* (Delhi, 1979).

into what must have been a diabolical forgery; but since we have not yet been furnished with the Committee's report, we are unable to say whether it did its obvious duty by instituting a searching inquiry into the matter, or merely manipulated the so called evidence secretly furnished to it, though never disclosed to us, in order to arrive at such eminently convenient results.

We are not, however, concerned here with anything beyond the one clear reason on which Government has publicly based its justification of our internment. And it is nothing but our freely expressing and promoting sympathy with our Muslim brethren, and maintaining our allegiance to the Khalifa of our Prophet (on whom be God's benedictions and peace) and Commander of the Faithful. This was the reason given in September 1917, for restrictions having been originally imposed on us in May 1915, and for the refusal to modify the orders nearly two and a half years later. This again ran through all the vague and flimsy charges regarding the *Khuddam-i-Ka'aba* Society and pan-Islamism furnished to us in November 1918. And, finally, this is the only justification now communicated to us alike for the Committee's findings and its recommendation and the Government's rejection of its advice urging our release.[3] We were interned because we freely expressed and promoted a sympathy, and maintained an allegiance demanded from us by our Islamic faith. We were not released along with Mrs. Besant and her co-workers because of this sympathy and this allegiance. And now that the Committee has found this sympathy and this allegiance to have provided full justification for our internment four years ago and for the subsequent refusal to release us, even the advice tendered by it to Government that we should now be released is itself based on the belief that neither the one nor the other can "interfere with the relations between Great Britain and Turkey". Finally, the Government rejects the advice and refuses to release us,

3 The conclusions of the Committee were that the government was justified in interning the Ali Brothers, but that they should be released because 'there is no longer occasion to apprehend that any views or activities of theirs can interfere with the relations between Great Britain and Turkey'. The government, however, did not accept this 'in view of the fact that the terms of peace have not yet been decided; and in view of the fact that there has been no change whatever in the attitude of the brothers...'.

because, thank God, "there has been no change whatever in the attitude of brothers". But because we are as staunch as ever in our faith in Islam and all that it implies, and hold the same view of honest Imperial policy as before, the destinies of the Empire as well as of the Khilafat must be settled behind our backs, while we are still bound hand and foot and gagged into the bargain in the interests of the Empire, and presumably also of Islam's safety !

Viewing the matter from the lower plane of politics, we now ask Your Excellency, what can be the significance of the Empire to an Indian if the mere expression of his opinion, declared by no court of law to be unlawful, with respect to a far-reaching settlement of the Empire's future relations with another Empire, involving, as they must, his own and his country's happiness or misery, prosperity or ruin, are permitted to be declared by the Executive and its nominees to be an "interference" and almost a crime. Such a doctrine if allowed to remain unchallenged, would reduce the Imperial idea to the meanest trickery ; for in the name of the Empire we shall continue to be asked to sacrifice not only wealth and life, but also our eternal salvation, and the only return that we shall continue to receive would be fetters and a gag. If this is to be the standardised value of Imperial citizenship, then we have clearly reached a stage when every Indian subject of His Majesty should seriously reconsider the bargain.

Looking at the matter, however, from the viewpoint of faith, this denial of liberty to "interfere with the relations between Great Britain and Turkey"—in other words, between the State and the Church of Islam—is itself nothing short of interference in a most vital matter of faith. Since Government cannot even now, when the eternal pretence of the war can no longer be pleaded as an excuse, restore to a Muslim the liberty he should never have lost, on the solitary ground that "there has been no change whatever in his attitude" in a vital matter of faith, and he is as unwilling as ever to prejudice his eternal salvation by forswearing the creed that demands from him the expression and promotion of sympathy with his brothers in faith, and the maintenance of his allegiance to the Commander of the Faithful, we are irresistibly driven to ask ourselves whether, consistently with our creed and its universally acknowledged implications, we and other Indian Muslims can any longer remain under British subjection.

For four long years we retained the fetters placed on our feet and did not remove the gag from our mouths. But what occurred during the four years of war with Turkey, and, still more, what is now being enacted at the Peace Conference, makes it obligatory that the seal of silence must be broken, and Government must be made to realise the extreme gravity of the issue that is being forced on the Muslim subjects of His Majesty.

Muslim loyalty and support had so often been assured to Government in our generation, and even Muslim contentment was so often unduly taken for granted, that other communities had with some justice made our attitude towards Government almost a matter of reproach. It was a strange return for all this loyalty and support that, without any effective protest, and often with the concurrence of His Majesty's Government, blow after blow was aimed at the temporal power of Islam. As a prominent Anglo-Indian newspaper admitted, "at all points the independent dominion of the Muslim was hemmed in and threatened, and the future seemed dark for its continuance in any part of the world". Government could not have been unaware of the sorrow and suffering that all this entailed for the Muslims of India. No section of the community remained unaffected or unmoved, and princes in their palaces and peasants in their huts alike passed anxious days and sleepless nights. Our public servants, that already carry on their shoulders the main burden of Indian administration so ungrudgingly and on such poor remunerations, and are yet so inordinately subservient to superior authority, and the very policemen, who are too often assumed to have no human sensibilities beyond the one lively desire to serve the bureaucracy, and at its bidding denounce every fellow-countryman of independent views—they, too, felt the shock of these successive blows, when Europe went on battering and disintegrating the temporal power of Islam, and threatened the Khilafat itself with isolation and rapid decay.

It was not, however, the fear of losing political dominance that troubled the Muslims most. The spiritual force of Islam does not depend on political supremacy, and for the most vital tradition of our faith is the humble beginning of Islam in the midst of hostile elements of extraordinary potency and malice, and the ceaseless persecution of our Prophet during

the greater part of his prophetic career, a tradition that was revived and rejuvenated by the martyrdom of his grandson, Husain, with his little band of two and seventy heroes on the ever memorable field of Kerbala.[6] What the cruel occurrences in Tripoli and the Balkans, at Holy Mashed[7] and Tabriz,[8] had led Muslims to apprehend was that the temporal power of Islam might be so weakened that it might become liable to suffer, without adequate power to prevent, the curtailment of its spiritual influence through the pressure of the temporal power of rival creeds.

The Muslim Press of India did everything in its power to warn Government against the disastrous consequences of the policy it seemed bent on pursuing, and no method was left untried of impressing on Great Britain that if she desired to retain the goodwill of the Muslims, a hundred millions of whom were members of her composite Empire, she must befriend and keep the Khilafat on her side, and deal more fairly and equitably with Muslim kingdoms and countries such as Persia, Afghanistan and Morocco. But not one of these warnings was heeded. The result was inevitable; and when war was declared between Great Britain and Turkey, some sort of an apologia as well as assurance was felt to be needed.

On the authority of His Majesty's Government, Your Excellency's predecessor gave a most solemn pledge "in regard to the Holy places of Arabia, including the Holy

6 Husain (626-680), the grandson of the Prophet and son of Ali, was martyred at Kerbala on 10 Muharram 61/October 680 by the troops of Yazid bin Muawiya. The Shia Muslims observe the first ten days of Muharram as days of mourning and lamentation.

7 A city in north-east of Iran in the province of Khurasan. It has a number of Muslim shrines and is a place of annual pilgrimage. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries it was important strategically because of its proximity to Russian and Afghan borders.

8 A city in north-west Iran of Azerbaijan province. The city was destroyed by Arab, Turkish and Mongol invaders until it was rebuilt by Shah Abbas I. It was held under Turkish control (1721-30) and by Russians (1827-28). The city was an object of conflict between Turks and Russians in World War I and of international dispute in 1946.

Shrines of Mesopotamia[9] and the port of Jeddah,[10] in order that there may be no misunderstanding on the part of His Majesty's most loyal Muslim subjects as to the attitude of His Majesty's Government in this war". This pledge was to the effect that "these Holy places and Jeddah will be immune from attack or molestation by the British military and naval forces"; and it was supplemented by the announcement that "at the request of His Majesty's Government, the Governments of France and Russia had given similar assurances." Nevertheless it is now admitted that "a close blockade of the coast of the Red Sea was instituted," and it is clear that the Arabs of the holiest of the Holy Places of Islam were threatened with certain starvation in order to compel them to revolt against their temporal sovereign and renounce the allegiance which they owed under the law of Islam to the legitimate successor of the Arabian Prophet. The chronicler of *The Times* newspaper adds that subsequently "events were so far advanced as to warrant a landing of arms at Rabegh," a coast town on the pilgrim route midway between the sacred *Harams* of Mecca and Medina. Later, "a meeting took place with one of the sons of the Amir and Grand Sherif of Mecca," and "the die was cast by the Grand Sherif for revolt." At British instigation, and presumably with British support, even if the precise nature of it has not yet been disclosed in India, the forces of the Servant of the Holy Places were attacked at Mecca, and the garrison fell into the hands of the renegades. Then began the siege of Jeddah, the port for Mecca explicitly included in the British pledge and Allied assurances of immunity, and here it is announced, without any apparent qualms, that the renegades had the assistance of "the supporting British warships." It is said that they "could not approach

9 Literally, from the Greek "the country between two rivers"; the region between the Tigris and Euphrates rivers, extending from the moun[illegible] tains of Asia Minor on the north to the Persian Gulf on the south. [illegible] to Arab conquest in mid-7th century A.D. Mesopotamia formed [illegible] Parthian, Roman and Sasanid empires; conquered by the Ottoma[illegible] in 1638 and was scene of British campaigns against the Turks from [illegible] 1918.

10 Jedda (Jidda), a port on Red Sea—46 miles west of [illegible] seaport—and a chief port for pilgrims to Mecca. Jedda was unde[illegible] control until 1916 when it yielded to the British and became par[illegible] Hejaz. In December 1925, Ibn-i-Saud occupied it after a year long [illegible]

nearer than 2,000 to 3000 yards. and the inevitable mirage made the shooting difficult." "Religious prejudice"—such is the phrase—"forbade the landing of a spotting officer." But—and this is sufficiently significant of the entire business—. "towards the end, when the ships' surgeon had ministered to the wounded Arabs, this latter difficulty was overcome." It is needless to pursue any further this chronicle of the manner in which a solemn pledge was kept in the case of Jeddah "in the spirit and letter." Medina, the sacred *Haram* of our Prophet, resisted the renegades of Mecca to the last ; so its surrender had to be provided for directly by the British in terms of the armistice forced on the Servants of the Holy places ; and even then his forces had to be made to evacuate the sacred *Haram* by means of a British threat. The third sacred *Haram* at Jerusalem was attacked practically by British forces alone.

As for Mesopotamia, the land of the Holy Shrines, a perusal of the Mesopotamian Commission's report makes it abundantly clear that an attack, which had been provided for a month before the declaration of war, was already in progress when the pledge of immunity was being given. With the varying fortunes of the war the desire of an advance on Baghdad varied in intensity. But the disastrous results of the Gallipoli campaign[11] made His Majesty's Government utterly regardless of their solemn assurances. On the 21st October 1915, less than a year after the pledge of 2nd November, 1914, we find the Secretary of State for India telegraphing to the Viceroy as follows :

> At the present moment...our position and prospects in Gallipoli are most uncertain...Arabs are wavering and will probably join Turks unless we can offer them great inducement. We are, therefore, in great need of striking success in the East ..It is suggested that we should occupy Baghdad giving assurance to Arab leaders that we favour creation of Arab State independent of Turks.

When these assurances were being contemplated, it seems the "great need of a striking success in the East had driven out all recollection of the solemn assurances that had been

11 Scene of battles in 191-16 in5 Allied campaign in World War I, in conjunction with naval bombardment of Dardanelles forts.

given to His Majesty's most loyal Muslim subjects." As the sequel has only too plainly proved, Holy Najaf,[12] Kerbala, Kazimain[13] and Samarra[14] remained no more immune from attack or molestation than did Baghdad *Sharif* and today all are alike under British occupation and control. Little was permitted to be published as to what actually occurred in these Holy Places when they were attacked or came to be occupied. But some news has always managed to trickle down to India, and even the little that Indian Muslims have been enabled to learn about these occurrences has caused widespread sorrow and resentment.

What is still more intolerable, Indian Muslims, including Rulers of States and their subjects, and civilians as well as soldiers, have been required to assist in the prosecution of a war against the Khilafat and given no option to stop further assistance when, in the exercise of his religious function, the Khalifa declared a *Jehad*. Government could not have been unaware of the great volume of sullen discontent created by this outrage on their faith, and although the terrorism exercised with the help of the Press and the Defence of India Act suppressed Muslim opinion, official papers have occasionally thrown a fierce enough light on this grave matter. In the Mesopotamian Commission's report are published extracts from a letter addressed by General Townshend[15] to Your Excellency's predecessor on 2nd November 1915, in which the following significant expressions occur :

> These troops of mine are tired and their tails are not up but slightly down : THE MUSLIMS ARE NOT PLEASED AT APPROACHING THE SACRED PRECINCTS OF

12 A town in Iraq on lake west of the Euphrates ; contains the Shrine of Ali, the cousin and son-in-law of the Prophet of Islam.

13 A town in Iraq with the shrine of the seventh Shia Imam, Musi Kazim.

14 Samarra, on the east bank of the Tigris river, was once the residence of the Abbasid rulers in the ninth century. The place is sacred to the Shia Muslims.

15 Charles Vere Ferrers Townshend (1861-1924) was a distinguished General. He drove Turks from Al Qaruna on Tigris and pursued them to Amara (1915) ; defeated the Turks and took Kut-el-Amara, but failed to capture Baghdad.

SULAIMAN PAK AT CTESIPHON—the troops are not confident and have had enough.

What the Muslim troops must have felt when they were being forced to advance on Jerusalem or Baghdad can easily be imagined, and it is not altogether unknown in India that some of them with greater moral courage than others gave expression to their religious scruples and paid the penalty of their faith.

As regards the question of the Khilafat, in the early part of the war, when British Protectorate was declared over Egypt, and a "Sultan" was set up in the place of the reigning Khedive in exile, the British Press was permitted to coquet freely with the idea of a transfer of the Khilafat to someone who could be trusted to register the decrees of the British Foreign Office; but for once Muslim opinion asserted itself, and the matter was allowed to drop. Subsequently, the renegade Sherif Husain assumed with the concurrence of the British, the title of "King" in a land in which the Sultans of Turkey were content to be merely Servants of the Holy Places, and apparently he was for a time encouraged to aspire to the title of the Commander of the Faithful, while the British Government continued to treat him as an ally and friend, and has now successfully assisted him in securing representation at the Peace Conference, where seventy million Indian Muslims, including such great Rulers of States as His Exalted Highness the Nizam, are still unrepresented. It is true that after the unsuccessful tour of the Sherif's agents in India, Government has repeated its earlier declaration that it recognises the question of the Khilafat to be "one for Muslim opinion alone to decide." But of what practical use is such an empty recognition if, on the one hand, those who maintain their allegiance to it as required by their faith are treated as criminals, and, on the other, an attempt is being made to dismember the Khalifa's Empire and weaken the temporal power of Islam by setting up a number of possible rivals in local and tribal chiefs?

A still more deplorable feature of the activities of the Allied and Associated Governments is that the *Jazirat-ul-Arab*, or the "Island of Arabia" carefully delimited by Muslim *Ulama* and lexicographers, over no part of which according to the testamentary injunctions of the Holy Prophet, non-Muslim

control is to be tolerated,[16] is proposed to be placed under the control of Christian Powers, with Great Britain herself as the controller of Hejaz. Palestine is already promised away by Great Britain and her associates and allies to the Jews, presumably as a belated reward for the Jews' treatment of Christ (on whom be peace). But it is forgotten that in the 7th century Christian priests and patriarchs had asked the Muslim besiegers of the Holy City to suspend hostilities, while they invited the Khalifa Umar and delivered into his hands the keys of Jerusalem.[17] It need hardly be recalled that when the entire Christendom waged a Holy War against the Muslim Servants of the Holy Place four and a half centuries later, and met with initial success, the Muslims contested with the crusaders for more than a century thereafter for the honour of serving the Holy City that was for fourteen years the *Qiblah* towards which their Holy Prophet and his companions used to pray, and that after rivers of blood had flown they finally repulsed the Crusaders fighting under an English king. Any designs on the Holy Land, however skilfully disguised, will only recreate the spirit of the Crusades which an Empire with a hundred million Muslim members may do only at its peril.

The war is now over; but the spirit of tyranny that it generated is still abroad, and while, on the one hand, it is being proclaimed in high sounding phrases that those who are assembled at Paris to decide the destinies of the world on a more equitable and human basis than Brute Force, are not the masters of the people but their servants, the Government, on the other hand, is denying to the people of India the barest expression of opinion on questions that vitally concern them. Not only is the gag not to be removed yet from our own mouths, but a gag of prodigious proportions has been prepared now for silencing more than three hundred millions of God's articulate creatures. The Rowlatt Bill just enacted in

16 'The mandate of Jazirat-ul-Arab', declared Mohamed Ali, 'has been given to us by the Prophet. No Christian or Jew can be the mandatory. The order to us is to expel the Christians and Jews from Arabia'. Home Poll. July 1925, NAI. The Jazirat-ul-Arab, according to Mazharul Haq, 'touches the deepest religious sentiments of the followers of Islam. This country must remain under the suzerainty of the Muslim Khalifa'. *Motherland*, 19, January 1922, quoted in Q. Ahmad, J.S. Jha, *Mazharul Haq* (Delhi, 1976), p. 91.

17 This refers to the surrender of the Patriarch Sophronius in 637.

the most tyrannical manner has ended the reign of law and substituted a reign of terror in its place, and although it affects every section of the people of India, the Muslims are certain to be its first and its worst victims. It has been the Muslim Press that has suffered most under the Press Act; and the same has been true of the Defence of India Act, if we only exclude the unfortunate youngmen of Bengal, rotting in solitary cells or swampy islands, without trial or hope of release. Even those who profess a pathetic optimism, and hope against hope that the bureaucracy armed with the strength of the giant will not use it as tyrannically as the giant, need only have access to our own experience to be cured of this distressing delusion. We, who have already had enough experience of "Executive discretion," and of "investigating authorities," sitting *in camera*, farcically inquiring into undefined charges and dealing with undisclosed "evidence" without the help of any code of procedure or law of evidence, submitting reports that cannot bear the light of the day, and being finally dismissed as ignorant persons for all their pains, can claim to speak with some authority, and say that the "Black Act" is nothing more or less than the virtual outlawry of a fifth of mankind.

The forfeiture of Dr. Ansari's Address, which should have been placed by Government with its fullest support on the table of the Peace Conference as an authoritative exposition of Islamic law on the subjects of the Khilafat, the *Jazirat-ul-Arab* and the Holy Places, and which was replete with Quranic texts and the Prophet's Traditions, is sure to create the impression that government is not only anxious to keep the Muslims muzzled when their fate is being discussed and decided by men of other creeds, but that India itself is no longer safe for Islam and its free exposition. But has the Government realised to what this would undoubtedly lead? When a land is not safe for Islam a Muslim has only two alternatives—*Jehad* or *Hijrat*. That is to say, he must either make use of every force God has given him for the liberation of the land and the ensurement of perfect freedom for the practice and preaching of Islam, or he must migrate to some other and freer land with a view to return to it when it is once more safe for Islam. This is no new doctrine, but as old as the eventful *Hijrat* of our Prophet 1,300 years ago in which the Muslim era had its birth and from which it takes its name.

In view of our present weak condition, migration is the only alternative for us, and if we are forced to foreswear our faith or leave our motherland, we could only migrate from this great country to which Islam brought its blessings more than twelve hundred years ago. A Muslim is required by his faith, which is Catholic and universal, to maintain an extra-ordinary detachment from country and race. But Islam is firmly based on the solid rock of human nature, and we are neither required to cultivate, nor have we in fact cultivated an unnatural indifference to the land we live in, or to the good people who inhabit it along with us. Millions of ties that have been formed in our twelve century long sojourn in India would seek to keep us tied down to it, and when we migrate, as we must, the minarets of our mosques would continue to beckon to us, and their domes, that would resound no more with the cries of "God is Greatest" would by their very silence recall us to them. And even if we proved unresponsive to the fraternal calls of the living, the non-Muslim compatriots with whom we have for so many centuries wrought for the good of our Motherland, and have together developed India's marvellous Arts and Culture, the graves of our ancestors would exercise over us their spiritual spell. But a greater call would make us leave this dear land of ours—never dearer than now that we would be taking our leave of it—for it would be the imperative call of religious duty. But when it is understood that we shall be leaving it only in order to work for its liberation from lawless laws and the restoration of all its rights and privileges as the land of the free that God had made it, and that it is destined soon to be, we do not fear we shall be accused of want of patriotism or of desertion in the hour of its peril. Our mosques and the bones of our ancestors we shall entrust to the loving and reverential care of our non-Muslim fellow-countrymen; and God in His beneficence and infinite mercy has not left us in these wonderful days without many convincing proofs that this sacred trust will be in safe and deserving hands.

This step which we shall now have to consider with all the seriousness that its very nature demands, will be perhaps the most decisive in the history of our community since the *Hijrat* of our Holy Prophet. Discouraging and bitterly painful as our experience has been in recent years, we feel that before we finally take it one more opportunity must be given to the

Government to review its attitude towards the people, and to see the drift of its policy of negation of *Swadharma* in addition to the neglect of Swadeshi and denial of Swarajya.

We have so far studiously refrained from referring to more exclusively political affairs, though true politics, which comprises all public activities of mankind, is to us, as it is to our guide, philosopher and friend, Mahatma Gandhi, as much part of our religion as the Muslim demand for the restoration of the Holy Places of Islam. Every legitimate claim must rest on the basis of Truth, and Truth is nothing but Faith. We therefore whole-heartedly identify ourselves with the clear and emphatic demand of the country for constitutional reforms and the better ensurement of our civic rights as voiced by the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League, now happily working together for the common weal. Having done this, we may for the present safely leave the advocacy of these general Indian claims in the hands of such great leaders of the people as Mahatma Gandhi, Lokmanya Tilak and Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, and other Congressmen and members of the League.

We have now only to define the more particularly Muslim demands, though we are happy in the belief that they are no longer exclusively urged by the Muslims of India, but have received from our fellow countrymen of other creeds also a firm pledge of support even unto death. These demands are as follows :

I. There should never be any attempt to interfere, by pressure or persuasion, in the free choice by the Muslims of the Khalifa of their Prophet.

II. No Muslim, whether a soldier or a civilian, should be asked to assist in any manner whatsoever in the prosecution of war, or of any other hostile design, against Khalifa when he has declared a *Jehad* in the exercise of the functions of the Khilafat and such assistance has become *hara'am* thereafter according to the law of Islam, and any Muslim at present undergoing any form of punishment for refusal to render such assistance should be given complete amnesty.[18]

18 'And any Muslims at present undergoing any form of punishment for refusal to render such assistance should be given complete amnesty', does not figure in the copy of this letter in the government records.

III. No part of the territories included in the expression *Jazirat-ul-Arab*, as defined by Muslim religious authorities and lexicographers, should be directly or indirectly occupied or subjected to any form of non-Muslim control, but must remain as heretofore under independent Muslim occupation and control, as required by the testamentary injunction of the Holy Prophet; and the present occupation and control of every portion of such territories opposed to the letter or the spirit of this injunction should forthwith cease.

IV. There should be no attempt to remove, whether directly or indirectly, from the independent, indivisible and inalienable sovereignty of the Khalifa, who is the recognised Servant of the Holy places and Warden of the Holy Shrines, any portion of the territories in which such Holy places and Shrines are situated, including, without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing expressions, the territories in which are situated the three Sacred *Harams* of Mecca, Medina, and Jerusalem, and the Holy Shrines in Najaf, Kerbala, Baghdad, Kazimain, Samarrah, Constantinople and Konieh, and such territories should forthwith be evacuated by the forces of His Majesty and of the Allied and Associated Governments, and restored to the Khalifa, the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire.

V. Nor should there be any such attempt to dismember and parcel out even among Muslim governments, or in any other manner weaken the Khalifa's Empire with the object of weakening the temporal power of Islam, and thereby make it liable to suffer, without adequate power to prevent, the curtailment of its spiritual influence through the pressure of the temporal power of other creeds.

VI. His Majesty's Government should restore to the Khalifa the Vilayet of Egypt so that it may once more be an integral portion of his Empire; and it should make determined efforts to induce other powers also to

restore similarly such other territories, like Bosnia,[19] Herzegovina,[20] and Tripoli, as they have forcibly taken from him; and similar justice should be done in the case of other Muslim territories like those of Algiers, Tunis, Morocco, the Caucasus[21] and the Khanates and kingdoms of Central Asia.

VII. If, as a result of the Peace Conference, the principle of Self-Determination is to be applied to the inhabitants of any territory, it should also be applied to the inhabitants of all territories that have been under Ottoman and other Muslim governments; and the agency for ascertaining the result of such self-determination, which should be proportionately Muslim, should include Indian Muslims, such as Rulers of Muslim Indian States, divines and political leaders, to be selected by the All-India Muslim League ; and the Muslim delegation should be free to act in the aforesaid territories on the divine injunction : "Verily all Muslims are brothers ; wherefore make peace between your brothers."

VIII. No Muslim should in any manner be deprived of his liberty, or otherwise punished, molested or disquieted by reason of his expressing and promoting sympathy with his brother Muslims in any part of the world, or maintaining and strengthening the allegiance of all Muslims to the Khalifa of the Holy Prophet and Commander of the Faithful ; and all persons thus dealt should be with forthwith set at liberty and all newspapers suppressed for a like reason should be permitted free publication and all monetary losses sustained by any person or newspaper through such action of government should be made good.

19 Bosnia was conquered by the Turks in 1463 and was the scene of insurrections against the Turkish rule, 1821-51; placed under the control of Austria-Hungary in 1878 and made part of the province of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which was formally annexed to Austria-Hungary and became a province of Yugoslavia in 1918.

20 By the Treaty of Berlin in 1878, Herzegovina was placed under the control of Austria-Hungary. It is now part of the Federated Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina in Yugoslavia.

21 Caucasus—region between the Black and Caspian Seas—was under nominal Persian and Turkish sovereignty until forced into connection with Russia.

IX. Greater respect should be paid in the future to the universal sentiment of Indian Muslims and determined efforts should be made by British Imperial authorities to earn the goodwill and cultivate the friendship of Muslim Governments, such as those of Turkey, Persia, Afghanistan and Morocco, by countenancing, whether on the part of His Majesty's Government or of others, no dealings that are not open, fair and equitable ; and as an earnest of this policy, such Muslim Governments should not be excluded from any of the benefits of any organisation such as the projected League of Nations, but should be made equal participants therein along with other Governments.

We now urge on Your Excellency's Government the extreme necessity of an early satisfaction of these legitimate demands of the Indian Muslim subjects of His Majesty. Having clearly and at considerable length explained our own position and that of our people, we desire to declare that we shall wait for a reasonable length of time for an indication of a change for the better in the government's attitude which the situation in India and abroad so urgently demands ; and if no convincing proof is given of such a change at an early date, and Indian and Muslim claims continue to receive the same disdainful treatment, it will be our imperative duty to ask for our passports, and to recommend the same grave and extremely painful step to our co-religionists, so that they and we could migrate to some other land where to be a believing Muslim and an ardent patriot is not considered a crime.

In the meantime we declare that so long as the "Black Act" remains on the Statute Book, we shall not consider ourselves bound to obey it and that we shall break it and other such laws also as we may break without prejudice to our faith, and are advised by our friends and fellow workers to break. We have for four long years done everything in our power that was consistent with our self-respect, and the dignity and dictates of our faith, to persuade Government to do us and our people justice. But Government has paid heed neither to our representations nor to the forbearance we have so long shown, and it has disdained to conciliate where it had the power to coerce. But fear of fellow man is no longer to be the compelling motive in India, and we hope and pray the only

fear that this land may know hereafter may be the fear of God. The Holy Quran, which has been our solace and our guide in every trouble had, thirteen hundred long years ago, provided for us both a warning and a way out of such difficulties as we and our people have to face today; nor has it left the glad tidings of reward unannounced. It says :

> O ye that believe ! seek assistance in patience and prayer ; verily Allah is with the patient. And do not speak of those that are slain in Allah's way as dead; nay, they are alive, but ye do not perceive. And we will most assuredly try ye with somewhat of fear and hunger and loss of property and lives and fruits; and give glad tidings to the patient. Who when misfortune befalls them, say : Verily we are Allah's and unto Him shall we assuredly return. Those are they on whom are blessings and mercy from their Lord, and those are the followers of the right course.

It has pleased God to try us in some of these ways, and we pray to Him to give us patience and courage to pass successfully through such other trials as may yet be in store for us. Our only talisman in all such tests and trials is a combination of patience and prayer; and, while taking the vow of patience, we pray for steadfastness and courage for ourselves and our people, and divine guidance for Government.

66. From Syed Ross Masood

Hyderabad Dn.
3 May 1919

Very distressing news has come to me from Aligarh to the effect that there has now taken place a general strike both amongst the students and the members of the staff. Unless something is done immediately I am afraid the place is doomed. I cannot tell you how extremely upset I feel about it all. It is like watching the death-throes of a much loved friend without being able to do anything to save him. I understand the Syndicate have decided to appoint Ziauddin as Principal. I was *never* officially approached in the matter. I did receive a private letter from my cousin asking me to let him know privately the lowest sum I would be willing to

accept as pay. After explaining to him my present pay and emoluments here which amount to Rs 1,900 I told him that I would be quite willing to give up everything if they agree to pay Rs 1000 and give me a free house and that theywere to pay the usual contribution of Rs 130 or so to the Government of India as that is a sum with which I have absolutely nothing to do and which has to be under the rules, mechanically paid to Government by those who borrow the services of its officers.[1] Had they agreed to this even then I believe they would have had to pay less on my behalf than they were paying to Tomb. I was then again privately informed that it was decided to pay me Rs 750 and that if I did not agree to this Ziauddin would be appointed. I was however never approached formally throughout the transaction. I am writing all this to you so as to inform you of all that has transpired since I received your very affectionate letter. It would be interesting for you to know why it is a physical impossibility for me to accept Rs 750. I have to pay Rs 370 every month for my children's education which you will easily understand I have had to do to save them from the fate from which I myself so miraculously escaped with the help of God. Rs 200 a month I am paying to my mother and have been doing so for the last six years for the sake of the numerous widows and orphans in our family. This too is a charge on me which it would be criminal for me to touch. This would leave me Rs 180 per month on which you can easily understand it would not have been possible for me and my family to live. I am writing this to you as I know that you more than anyone else can understand the intense mental torture through which I have had to pass. The truth of the matter is that in reality no one at Aligarh wanted me and rather than have the courage to say so, the attempt was made to create circumstances which would make it impossible for me to take up the work at Aligarh in spite of any sacrifice that I might be willing to make.[2]

I returned only last week from Aligarh where I had to go and see Zohra[3] who had to be operated upon for appendicitis.

1 This was conveyed at the meeting of the trustees on 28 April 1919.

2 One of the points made at the meeting was that it was inconsistent with the dignity of Syed Ahmad Khan's grandson to bargain for his appointment.

3 She was married to Ross Masood in 1914, but the marriage broke down in 1928. Zohra went back to her parents home in Aligarh.

She is well now but the College affairs seem to have crushed me entirely for the moment. The position now is extraordinarily humiliating. If a non-Indian is appointed as Principal of our College it will become obvious that those who cannot manage the affairs of a College have no right to say that they can look after those of their country and the idea now is to get an Englishman from England.[4] In fact it has been decided by the Syndicate to keep Ziauddin till such a man is found. Personally I have much doubt whether Ziauddin has enough strength of character to save the place from the enormous dangers with which it is faced.

You will thus understand how it is that I am for the first time in my life feeling the pathos of not having any private income of mine.

I leave for England in a fortnight as I have taken 6 months leave. My address there will be c/o Thomas Cook & Son, Ludgate Circus, London, or c/o Aftab Ahmad Khan, Member Secretary of States Council, India Office, London.

4 The reference is probably to the rumour that R.M. Sletham, Principal of Kumbakonum College in Madras, had been offered Principalship of M.A.O. College, Aligarh.

67. To Benjamin Robertson*

Chhindwara
9 May 1919

In our letter of the 24th April addressed to His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General of India we have clearly and at considerable length explained our own position and that of our people, and, after defining the legitimate demands of the Muslims concerning the Khilafat, the *Jazirat-ul-Arab* and the Holy Places, we urged on His Excellency's Government the extreme necessity of their early satisfaction. In concluding that letter we have declared that "we shall wait for a

*Home Poll. A, July 1919, 2-32, NAI.

reasonable length of time for an indication of a change for the better in the Government's attitude which the situation in India and abroad so urgently demands, and that if no convincing proof is given of such a change at an early date, and Indian and Muslim claims continue to receive the same disdainful treatment, it will be our imperative duty to ask for our passports, and to recommend the same grave and extremely painful step to our co-religionists, so that they and we could migrate to some other land where to be a believing Muslim and an ardent patriot is not considered a crime". We are still awaiting sufficiently convincing proofs of a change in Government's attitude; though we regret to have to say that none has so far been furnished.

We had also declared in that letter that in the meantime "so long as the 'Black Act' remained on the Statute Book, we shall not consider ourselves bound to obey it, and that we shall break it and such other laws also as we might break without prejudice to our faith, and are advised by our friends and fellow-workers to break". In deference to the appeal of our friend and counsellor, Mahatma Gandhi, we refrain at present from civil disobedience of other laws. But the Defence of India Act is admittedly the model on which the Black Act has been framed; and now that the war is virtually over, there can be no possible excuse for continuing the restrictions imposed under the Act on the liberty of any person during the war, much less on ours whose restoration to freedom, even an unfairly constituted committee appointed by Government itself had advised several months ago. We have, therefore, after very careful and prolonged consideration, decided that from this day forward we should not consider ourselves interned under the Defence of India Act, which was an unjust, and, in fact, an unlawful measure, and has been administered in an unjust and tyrannical fashion.

Only a week now remains for us to complete four long years of subjection to this tyranny, and on declaring our refusal to remain in subjection to it any longer, we invite Government to examine "the political situation in all its bearings", which, in its opinion, the Committee it had itself appointed was not in a position to appreciate. Is that situation any better on the 9th May, 1919, than it was on the 16th May, 1915, when we were first interned ; or has it steadily grown

appreciably and palpably worse? If Government is not too reckless even now to ascertain the outcome of its policy of coercion and "frightfulness" into which it had plunged, and which it has only too relentlessly pursued, it has only to look around. Just as one lie has to beget a thousand others blacker than itself in order to sustain it, repression always needs more and more repression even to have the appearance of being effective; and each succeeding dose has to be made more potent in order to inspire the desired degree of terror. The only justification of repression is its success; and when it finally fails, as it must, there is nothing left to take its place. If government could even now be made to "appreciate the political situation in all its bearings", and honestly face facts, it could not take long to discover that today coercion stands condemned as a dismal and ghastly failure. But there is yet a chance of retrieving a well-nigh hopeless situation, for the people of India are incredibly forgiving and kind-hearted.

For our part, we have already declared that from this day forward we shall not consider ourselves bound to carry out the requirements contained in the orders issued to us under the Defence of India Act. But for the present we shall continue to reside in Chhindwara, and are willing to pay such reasonable rent for the house we occupy and the furniture therein as the Government may fix. Of course, we shall not hereafter trouble Government to provide any subsistence allowance which it has found so difficult to raise to an extent that could accord with our rank in life or even our restricted requirements.

We have had numerous enough occasions during our sojourn in this Province to feel dissatisfied with the manner in which your subordinate officials have dealt with us, and occasionally we have had to complain of it. This makes it all the more necessary that before we close this letter we should declare, as we now do, that on the only occasion on which we met you during our internment, viz., on March 24, last, we found you fair and sympathetic, and also appreciative of the forbearance we have so long shown. For this we offer our thanks.

68. To Commissioner of Police, Bombay*

Chhindwara
14 May 1919

We note that the local government of Bombay has under section 12(1) of the Indian Press Act declared the forfeiture of all printed copies of our representation to His Excellency the Viceroy on the subject of the Muslims' religious duties and communal sentiments and their demands on the subject of the Khilafat, the *Jazirat-ul-Arab* and the Holy Places of Islam including the demand for exemption of all Muslims, whether soldiers or civilians from every form of assistance in prosecuting a war or other hostile designs against the Khalifa and those engaged in *Jehad* when in the exercise of his religious function he has declared a *Jehad* and all further assistance of this kind has become *hara'am* or forbidden. We do not believe that this declaration is legal or in any way justified, and desire to contest its validity in a law court. We hereby tender a copy of our representation declared to be forfeited, and hereby give you notice that if you seize it, you do so under our protest. If, however, you chose to do so, kindly intimate the fact to us by return post, and acknowledge the receipt of this communication and of the copy of our representation herein enclosed.

Mohamed Ali
Shaukat Ali

*Home Poll. A, July 1919, 2-32, NAI.

69. To Governor of Bombay*

Chhindwara
14 May 1919

We have learnt that Your Excellency-in-Council has by a notification in the local official Gazette declared forfeited to

*Home Poll. A, July, 1919, 2-32, NAI.

His Majesty all printed copies of our representation addressed to His Excellency the Viceroy on the 24th April last on the subject of the Khilafat, the *Jazirat-ul-Arab* and the Holy Places of Islam, and embodying Muslim demands, including the demand that when in the exercise of his religious function, the Khalifa has declared *Jehad*, no Muslim, whether a soldier or a civilian, should be asked to give any sort or kind of assistance in the prosecution of a war or other hostile design against him and those engaged in the *Jehad*, since it becomes *hara'am* or forbidden thereafter according to Muslim law.

We consider Your Excellency's declaration illegal, both in form and substance, and desire to have its validity tested in the High Court of Judicature at Bombay. We have accordingly submitted a printed copy of the above representation which is our property to the Commissioner of Police, Bombay, requesting him to intimate it to us by return of post if he seizes it under the Press Act, and informing him that he would seize it under our protest.

Your Excellency may perhaps be aware that one of the most distinguished Chief Justices of the High Court of Bombay in a judgement that he delivered as a Chief Justice of the High Court of Calcutta, referred to the Act under which Your Excellency in Council has acted in the following terms :

The Advocate-General has convinced me that the Government's view of this piece of legislation is correct, and that the High Court's power of intervention is the narrowest ; its power to pronounce on the legality of the forfeiture by reason of failure to observe the mandatory conditions of the Act is barred ; the ability to pronounce on the wisdom of the Executive order is withheld ; and its functions are limited to consider whether the applicant to it has discharged the almost hopeless task of establishing that his pamphlet does not contain words which fall within the all comprehensive provisions of the Act.

I describe it as an almost hopeless task because the terms of Section 4 are so wide that it is scarcely conceivable that any publication would attract the notice of the Government in this connection to which some provision of that section might not, "directly or indirectly, whether by inference, suggestion, allusion, metaphor, implication or otherwise" apply.

In another place in the same judgement he said :

The provisions of Section 4 are very comprehensive and its language is as wide as human ingenuity could make it. Indeed it appears to me to embrace the whole range of varying degrees of assurance from certainty on the one side, to the very limits of impossibility on the other. It is difficult to see to what lengths the operation of this section might not be plausibly extended by an ingenious mind. They would certainly extend to writings that may even command approval. An attack on that degraded section of the public which lives on the misery and shame of others would come within this widespread net ; the praise of a class might not be free from risk. Much that is regarded as standard literature might undoubtedly be caught.

Such is the piece of legislation under which Your Excellency's Government has acted, and almost hopeless is the task that we have been set in establishing the negative that our representation to His Excellency the Viceroy, intended merely to induce the Government of India and the Imperial authorities to undertake a much-needed reform of their attitude towards Islam and Muslims, does not deserve the fate it has met at the hands of Your Excellency's Government. But even this almost hopeless task becomes perfectly hopeless if we are prevented from applying to the High Court of Bombay to exercise even the "narrowest power of intervention" allowed to it under the Press Act, and appearing before it to establish an almost impossible negative. Although on the 9th instant we have at long last intimated to the local Government that we shall no longer consider ourselves bound to comply with the requirements as to residence in a specified area, among others, contained in the orders issued to us under the Defence of India Rules. We have no reason to believe that those orders have been yet withdrawn. In the circumstances our exit from this place may be barred, and we prevented from proceeding to Bombay to contest the validity of the declaration of Your Excellency-in-Council. This would be such a manifest denial of justice that we cannot conceive Your Excellency would tolerate it ; and it is in this belief that we now apply to you to arrange with the Government of India that we should be provided with due facilities for the purpose of seeking the redress that even such a narrowly conceived and tyrannical measure as the Press Act makes it just possible to secure at the hands of the law.

70. To Maharaja of Holkar*

14 May 1919

We have the honour of submitting herewith a copy of the representation we had addressed on April 24th last to His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General of India. It contains the demands of the Muslims on the subjects of the the *Juzirat-ul-Arab*, Khilafat reserved by our Holy Prophet for Muslim sovereignty and occupation alone, and the Holy Places of Islam of which the Khalifa alone is the universally recognised Servant and Warden.

So far the British Imperial authorities do not seem to have respected sufficiently the Muslim religious point of view, nor appreciated a Muslim's imperative religious obligations and duties, and if this attitude continues throughout this great world crisis, it means the disruption of the Empire which Indian princes must endeavour to prevent as much as British Indian subjects. Knowing that Your Highness has Muslim subjects also who share these obligations, aspirations and sentiments with us, and who receive equal consideration at Your Highness's hands with their non-Muslim fellow subjects, and knowing again that Your Highness has at this moment in His Highness the Maharaja Saheb of Bikaner[1] a representative at the Peace Conference at Paris and finally that Your Highness can guide the British Government aright at a moment when it needs such guidance greatly, we have ventured to submit for Your Highness's perusal this representation of ours, and we trust that recognising the perfect justice of our demands Your Highness will advise the Government to satisfy them at a very early date. In concluding this prayer we need only state that we love this dear country of ours and desire

*Home Poll. A, July 1919, 22-32, NAI. Raj Rajeshwar Sawai Shri Tukoji Rao Holkar (b. 1890). He was succeeded by Yashwantrao Holkar (b. 1908). The son was educated in England (1920-23) and again from 1926 to 1929 at Oxford.

1 (b. 1880); was one of the ruling Princes of India entitled to a salute of 19 guns; served in the British army in the First World War in France and in Egypt; was one of the three representatives of India at the Imperial War Cabinet and Conference, 1917 and 1919; Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes 1921-24.

that peace and prosperity, contentment and progress should have perpetual reign here ; but we feel that this is wholly impossible if a fourth of its population is made to think that it is no longer safe for Islam, the faith it believes in and practices and would preach in a peaceful manner. The Muslims are being driven to this conclusion, and we appeal to Your Highness, although you do not share their faith, to assist them as their compatriot and the ruler of Muslims and non-Muslims alike to keep their motherland safe for their faith and to strengthen thereby the foundations of this great Empire which must otherwise totter to the ground.

Confident in the ancestral courage of Your Highness and in your great regard for your Muslim subjects as well as your loyalty to the Empire.

P.S. With Your Highness's permission we may add just one word more. Already this attitude of the British Imperial authorities seems to be on the point of involving them in a war with a neighbouring Muslim kingdom which, in view of its small size and resource and the need of the ruler to consolidate his position at home after the tragic events that have brought him to this throne, could never have otherwise dreamt by invading such a vast and resourceful Empire as ours. Before we precipitately accept this quarrel as our own, we owe a duty to truth and justice and religious toleration to ascertain for ourselves that it is not due to the very attitude which drives Indian Muslims to contemplate the only other alternative in the circumstances, viz., migration, because they are too weak to resort to *jehad.*

71. To Nawab of Jaora[1]

15 May 1919

We have already forwarded for Your Highness's perusal the representation we submitted to His Excellency the Viceroy on

1 Home Poll. A, July 1919, 2-32, NAI. See Hasan (ed.), *Mohamed Ali, in Indian Politics : Select writings*, vol. 1., p. 36, f.n. 1.

the 24th April. When we wrote that representation we could not have dreamt that the attitude of the British Imperial authorities and the Government of India which had driven us to contemplate *Hijrat* would drive the Muslim kingdom beyond our borders to declare *jehad*. But the ways of Providence are not always foreseen by mortals, though the motive of the two actions being the same, we can feel what the young and spirited Amir must have felt concerning Islam and the Khilafat. This war is clearly not ours and we do trust that none of us will be stampeded into taking up another's quarrel and fighting another's battle. We are prepared to spare our dear Motherland all risks of war by approaching His Majesty the Amir and asking him to sheath the sword he has unsheathed obviously in the cause of Islam and justice to India, provided all our demands, Indian and Muslim, are forthwith conceded. But otherwise, let those who have provoked this holy war fight it out. We cannot help them and must act upto our faith and according to our capacity. Your Highness is a Muslim and God's slave and the Prophet's follower first and an ally and friend of the British next and even if the Government can be included in the expression '*Alilamer Minkum*' we have first to obey God and His Prophet and the commandment [Arabic] and if there is disagreement on any point refer it to Allah and the Prophet if you believe in Allah and the day of Judgement makes it clear whom we must serve in such a contingency as this. This is no time for sermons and we have been but indifferent followers of our great and Holy Prophet. But with all our sins we do love this dear faith of his and we know Your Highness also to do the same. That is why we address this appeal to Your Highness to live up to the faith that is ours and the example of our saints and martyrs and we pray to God to give Your Highness and all of us the necessary strength and power and fortitude and steadfastness. Our past is now being intercepted because after 4 long years of incarceration we have decided since the 9th instant to abide by the Defence of India Act no more. We have taken care, however, that this letter of ours should reach Your Highness safely and we accept the fullest response in action, though no letter in reply. Kindly convey our appeal for the pursuit of truth and justice and love of India to your friend His Highness the Maharaja Saheb of

Rutlam who is a gentleman and a Prince among men and also to other princes whom Your Highnesss can influence in so noble a cause. We want peace and prosperity in India, but if through folly or want of courage we are every time stampeded into fighting the battles of others we shall have neither the one nor the other. Your Highness can yet endeavour to influence the Government and bring it to realise the madness and the grave injustice of its present course and we appeal to you in the name of Islam, of India ay ! even in the name of the Empire to do all you can to make Government understand the true situation even today. May you succeed and may God bless you. With affectionate and devoted admiration from both of us.

72. To Editor, *Medina* (Bijnor)*

Chhindwara
22 May 1919

God is great.

"I am being dragged for love of you and there is a great noise : Do come to the roof yourself as it is sight worth seeing".

Dear Sir, Greetings. We shall be grateful if you will by way of justice help the proclaiming of the word of truth by the publication of this letter. You might be knowing that we sent our last petition to the Viceroy on the 24th April, and in that letter we frankly stated all those religious ordinances the obedience of which was obligatory on every Muslim as a Muslim. We had hoped that the valid demands of the Muslims would be attended to, and the stability of the Empire would be secured by a decision in respect of the demands in accordance with the Muslim desires. But we have come to know through newspapers that that letter has been proscribed (forfeited) in different provinces under the Press Act. As

*Home Poll. A, September 1919, 406-428, NAI. This letter was intercepted by the Superintendent of Police, Bijnor. The first three lines of the letter are translation of a well known Persian couplet in which the lover asks the beloved to come to the roof and see that the former is being killed.

ıat letter has probably not been seen by anyone, so there is danger of mistrust and doubt. It is our duty to inform all ur friends generally that that did not contain anything which ›uld be objected to by any faithful Muslim or with which ıy just non-Muslim could not sympathise. In spite of our eakness and helplessness, we have such confidence in our 'uthfulness and love of justice that we shall shortly, with the ɛlp of God, gain success against this order of forfeiture in ıe High Courts of Nagpur and Bombay by appeal. May od help us and give us and all the country strength that we ay not hesitate to utter words of truth and by serving 'uthfulness thus gain the blessings of religion and of the 'orld.

We are very sorry to hear that security of Rs 1000 of the :ehri Nimroz Press, Bombay, has been confiscated for printıg this letter and now a fresh security of Rs 10,000 is emanded. We were able to fully help Mr. Muhammad 'usaf Mazein. We request all truth-abiding friends to help ıem by a public subscription in which we shall take pride to ›in according to our ability. We request our Muslim and ountry brethren not to distrust us and to be the means of the etterment and improvement of religion and country after :cing all the troubles and trials with endurance and truthfulness and patience. As for us :

I after losing all the wordly gain for thee ;
Thought that there was something better than this in store for me.

3. From M.K. Gandhi*

Laburnum Road
Gamdevi
Bombay
23 May 1919

:y dear friends,

write with a heavy heart, for I see that I have disagreed with ou on these things and my disagreement must pain you, as it

*The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi, vol. 15, pp. 317-18.

has already considerably pained me. I wonder whether Mr. Ghate ever received my letter[1] which was meant for you, and whether if he did, you got it. That letter explains my position regarding your memorial to the Viceroy. I shall try briefly to re-explain it, as having received no reply from you, I fear that you have not seen my letter to Mr. Ghate.

I consider that your memorial was too undignified for the great cause you are espousing and of which I have felt you are pre-eminently the embodiment and for which you have suffered without a murmur all the long years and are still suffering. Your language was inflammatory and too full of declamation for a memorial. Your statement of the Muslim claim instead of representing an irreducible minimum was an exaggeration. I am sure, you do not propose to raise questions affecting issues that were rightly or wrongly settled long before the war. You have a right to claim the restoration of the temporal status of Islam as it existed at the time of the outbreak of war. I would like you even now to redraft your memorial, make a reasoned and logical statement that must arrest and command the attention of the world. The success of any cause naturally necessarily depends finally upon the will of God. But that will is almost conditioned by the manner in which we who approach the throne of the Almighty conduct ourselves and nothing avails there but cold reason sanctified by truth, humility and strictest moderation. In the new memorial, I would omit all mention of personal suffering. It stands as a living record speaking for itself. If you adopt my proposal, I would love to revise your draft.

The two other things in which I have disagreed with you are your two letters sent to the Press for publication. You now know why I stopped the publication of your first letter. The second letter just received has also been stopped for the same reasons, but the additional reason for not printing it is that your plea for Mr. Nazim is unmerited. When the crucial movement came he stood not for truth but for untruth. I am sorry for him, but I cannot feel with you that the action [the] authorities took was wrong. He made a deliberately false statement, when he was challenged and when it was his

1 Dated 8-5-1919.

special duty to make a correct statement. I will not weary you you with the full particulars of this painful episode.

I must confess too that I do not like your half disobedience of the order of the internment. I do not know that you got my message sent to you, after my discharge at Bombay, that you need not disobey the order of internment and I would like you, if you could summon up the courage, to recall the notice of disobedience and tell the Viceroy that upon mature consideration and for the sake of the cause for which you stand, you have decided not to disobey the order for the time being.

You may not know that in my recent confidential letters to the Viceroy and the Governor of Bombay, I have definitely raised the Muslim question confining it to Khilafat and the Holy Places....

74. From M.A. Ansari*

Delhi
30 May 1919

May peace be on you. This is perhaps my seventh or eighth attempt to write to you. When I write a letter and read it, it appears so different from my real ideas that I have to tear it. Today I have made a firm resolve that whatever may happen I would write the letter. You must have learnt of my difference of opinion from Shaukat Bhai. Then I was against '*Hijrat*' (i.e., migration) only, but I was entirely in favour of Satyagraha. In Delhi I have had ample experience of Satyagraha. Though on the 30th March[1] I was not in Delhi, but from the 1st of April to its end whole day and night I spent all my time in observing the movement of Satyagraha

*This is a translation of Dr. Ansari's letter to Mohamed Ali. It was intercepted by the Deputy-Commissioner, Chhindwara. Home Poll. A, September 1919, 406-428, NAI.

1 The Rowlatt Satyagraha in Delhi began on this day.

with its results and in allaying the excitement and uneasiness that was then common in the public mind, and eventually I came to the conclusion that it was impossible to carry on the satyagraha on the principles on which its originator Mahatma Gandhi wishes it to be carried out in the present circumstances. There are many causes for its failure and some of these causes are such that we have, if not absolutely none, very little control over them.

In these circumstances I considered the Satyagraha movement to be practically impossible and wholly unprofitable and severed my connection with the 'Satyagraha Sabha'! This is my opinion about Indians generally; except some selected people I consider Muslims generally absolutely unfit to act on the principles of Satyagraha. In my humble opinion Satyagraha is an impracticable movement. Of course under the direct supervision of Mahatma Gandhi this movement may perhaps succeed to a certain extent.

Having regard to my views above recorded, I consider your new declaration as not useful. Also your public declaration addressed to (His Excellency) the Viceroy appears to be inopportune and ill-timed. Though I sincerely eulogise the strength of faith, uprightness and steadfastness of you both brothers, I feel it my duty that I should let you also know my views.

The Martial Law in the Punjab, and the consequent angry mood of the Government, and the commencement of troubles on the Frontier are such events that they would not permit the Government to form a decided opinion regarding the question of internment of you both, and the result of your writing would not be as desired.

My request is that you people should exercise further patience and fortitude till there is peace, and should let the restrictions of internment continue, so that after peace both of you may be released at the earliest possible moment and be of service to your native country.

Whatever personal losses you both have suffered owing to your internment, your country and nation have on account of your long internment suffered at least as much loss if not more.

You have demonstrated your steadfastness, perserverance and strength of faith to be so unshakeable that your influence

and love in the minds of your countrymen have increased very much.

I need not assure you how much such practical workers like yourself have to face, the mental and more sufferings on account of the conditions of internment, and that the losses you have suffered are irreparable. But in spite of all these things I would again beseech you to be patient and steady and not plunge yourself into new dangers by breaking the rules of internment. May the bountiful Providence save you from all dangers.

The man of the Nawal Kishore Press would come to see the Press tomorrow. He hopes that some suitable arrangement will be arrived at. I am endeavouring very much that it may be sold soon. Moazzam has arranged to send some money to 'Bhabi' (i.e., Mrs. Mohamed Ali). I hope it will be of some assistance (salutations).

75. From M.K. Gandhi*

Laburnum Road
Bombay
29 June 1919

I have been following everything about you since your being taken to the Betul Jail.[1] I still retain the opinion I had formed regarding your memorial. Anyway, if you are permitted to write letters, I would like to have your views about the Government communique issued in justification of the orders

*Home Poll. A, September 1919, 406-28, NAI. This letter was intercepted and withheld.

1 In June 1919, the government issued orders under Regulation III of 1818 for the detention of the Ali Brothers at Betul in the Central Provinces. This was done, according to a notification, because 'the Government of India have ample evidence that the brothers are pursuing an active campaign of hostility against the government and having advocated assistance to the Amir of Afghanistan. They are also satisfied that the restrictions hitherto imposed upon them at Chhindwara under the Defence of Indian Act are not sufficient to prevent them from inciting loyal Muslims to discard their attitude of loyalty'. Home Poll. A, July 1919, 2-32, NAI.

of imprisonment. I have advised friends to keep absolutely quiet about yourself, as I am most anxious that not a single false step is taken. I hear that you are keeping well, and that you are receiving all the consideration that can be given in a prison. I shall look forward to your letter. I need hardly say that you are never out of my mind, although we may not for some time come to meet face to face. I am in close touch with our public men, as also with those in authority regarding the Muslim question.

76. To Chelmsford*

Jail, Betul (C.P.),
9th July, 1919

At 4 a.m. on the 8th June, 1919, we were roused from sleep at our house in Chhindwara by the District Magistrate of Chhindwara, two other magistrates, and a number of police, and even P.W.D. officers, attended by an extraordinarily and, if we may say so, needlessly large police force which had surrounded the house; and we were removed in motor-cars under a strong police escort before we had bade good-bye to our people, and even before we had finished dressing. It was only after we had arrived at Betul and had been lodged in jail that we had an opportunity of seeing the warrant issued over the signature of Sir William Marris, and learnt that this action had been taken by Your Excellency's Government under the Bengal State Prisoners Regulation (III of 1818). A most minute search of our house at Chhindwara was also conducted by several high officials of the C.I.D., who, however, found nothing that could have justified such a search. We mention the time and the manner of our removal and refer to this vexatious and inquisitorial visit of the C.I.D. as these circumstances serve to indicate the character that has manifestly been

*_Freedom of Faith and its Price_ (London, n.d.), pp. 123-155. This book was circulated by Mohamed Ali during his stay in England in 1920 where he went as member of the Khilafat Delegation. It includes correspondence on various aspects of the case concerning his internment.

ascribed to us by some of the local officers of Chhindwara and the danger that our residence there has evidently been represented to Government to have created.

2. As Your Excellency is no doubt aware, we were first interned on the 16th May, 1915, under the Defence of India Act; but no reasons were at the time disclosed for this action of Government beyond the declaration that in the opinion of the Chief Commissioner of Delhi we had acted in a manner prejudicial to the public safety. Subsequently, on more than one occasion, various reasons were assigned on behalf of Government for our internment, and for its continuance; but it was not until three-and-a-half years had elapsed from the date of our internment that we were given any kind of opportunity to meet the charges against us ; and then, too, the statement supplied to us disclosed nothing beyond vague and indefinite allegations, without any particulars as to time, place, or person, let alone the evidence on which they purported to be based, which was explicitly refused. Although it appeared wholly futile to us to submit any representation with reference to so meagre a statement of reasons for our internment, and that, too, to a most unsatisfactory Committee appointed to investigate our case *in camera* and in our absence, except for the one occasion when we were called to appear before it and be subjected to an examination by it, and although we were generally advised to let such an investigation proceed without any assistance from us, we, nevertheless, decided to act differently, as we did not desire that those interested in keeping us interned as long as they could manage to do it, on one pretext or another, should have any excuse for saying that we shirked an investigation. We, therefore, submitted very full and detailed representations to the Committee which lacked nothing in the way of frankness and the volunteering of every item of information that could possibly have any bearing on the vague allegations made against us ; and we also appeared in person before it to answer the questions that it chose to put to us. We may add that, although we were treated with the utmost courtesy by the members of the Committee, the manner in which their investigation was conducted was not in the least illuminating ; and, since we have had access neither to the evidence placed by the C.I.D. before it nor to its report to Government embodying its findings on that *ex parte* evidence,

we are to this day ignorant of the facts on which our internment could have been based with any degree of plausibility. All that we were favoured with by the Committee was the negative piece of information that had its own significance—viz., that nowhere in the evidence placed before it by the C.I.D. was there any trace of the highly treasonable letters, including the invitation to the late Amir of Afghanistan to invade India, which had at the eleventh hour come in the way of our release some two years ago.

3. On the 9th May last we wrote to the Chief Commissioner of these Provinces and not to the Deputy Commissioner of Chhindwara, as inaccurately stated in the Press *communique* issued from Simla on the 8th June regarding our detention under Regulation III of 1818, that from that day forward we would not regard ourselves as bound by the orders of internment. This was, as we made clear in the letter itself, by way of protest against the Rowlatt legislation and the repression increasingly practised by Government. It was manifest from this, and also from our general behaviour thereafter, which has always been frank and open, that we were willing to afford the authorities every facility for getting us tried for breach of internment orders in the ordinary courts of law ; and it is obvious that we would not have complained if, after an open trial properly conducted in such a court, we had been found guilty and punished to the fullest extent of its powers.

4. But, instead of that, Government has once more resorted to the growing practice of punishing first and justifying its action afterwards, without having recourse to any judicial proceeding whatever. We shall not pretend to express a surprise at such proceedings that we have not in fact experienced; but we must say we did not expect, after our experience during four long years of internment, that, while as usual giving us no opportunity to submit any explanation of our conduct, Government would attempt an immediate public justification of its own action and issue an official *communique* in regard to it. We, who were far more intimately concerned with the matter than any member of the general public, have not yet been favoured with a copy of it, and in fact came to peruse it only casually fully ten days after it was issued.

5. Even then we have awaited for three weeks an invitation from Government to submit a statement of our own regarding

the grounds of its determination to detain us in jail as State prisoners, so that we could assist it in such a revision thereof as, in the words of the Preamble of Regulation III, "the ends of justice require." But in spite of the very general desire of the Indian Press, which does not yet seem to be convinced that we had acted in the objectionable manner described in the *communique* of 8th June, that an opportunity should be given to us not only to submit to Government, but to publish also such a statement, no invitation has hitherto reached us. Nevertheless, once more solely with the object of not allowing the case to go against us by default, we submit the following statement, and shall only add that since Government has seen fit to publish an official *communique* regarding our recent conduct which we regard as inaccurate and incomplete, and consequently misleading and wholly unjust to us, it should in common fairness to us and to the public, that thinks better of us than it does, give this statement of ours equal publicity.

6. At the very outset we should like to state that we are content to suffer even greater hardships than this complete loss of our liberties for actions of ours that we admit, and we have no desire to keep back anything from the Government or from the public. But it is a pity that actions to which we cannot with any truth plead guilty are mixed up with those we readily confess, and needless confusion is thereby created. It is indeed an unfortunate circumstance that we cannot at once deal with the main issue over which it seems that we and the Government are divided—namely, the religious views that we share with Indian Muslims and in fact with the Muslims of the entire world, regarding the Khilafat and *Jehad*, the *Jazirat-ul-Arab* and the Holy Places of Islam, and incidentally the attitude that, in strict accordance with the tenets of Islam, we have adopted towards His Majesty the Amir of Afghanistan at the present juncture. Before we can deal with the main issue we have to clear away a number of inaccuracies contained in the Press *communique* which make its contents so misleading.

7. To begin with, it has been stated that

> "In April, 1919, the Government of India received definite information that the brothers Messrs. Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali were taking active measures to stir up ill-will against the Government. While the question of taking steps to prevent these activities was under

consideration, a memorial from the brothers was received by the Viceroy."

Now, we can say most emphatically that no such measures were taken by us before we submitted our representation on the 24th April to Your Excellency, nor have any been taken since, and we are in a position to demonstrate the truth of even so negative an assertion with the utmost ease.

8. It should be remembered that the Committee appointed by Your Excellency's Government to enquire into our case did not leave Chhindwara before the 8th December, 1918. We expected that the result of the enquiry would be communicated to us by about the middle of December; but that was not done, and, while still awaiting it, we were permitted to visit Rampur, where we stayed till the middle of January. While we were at home, and again on our return, we wrote to the Local Administration requesting an early intimation of the decision of the Government on the Committee's advice, which, as these letters clearly indicated, we believed to have favoured our release, and to have received the powerful support of no less an authority than the Secretary of State for India himself. Not receiving any intimation from Nagpur, we wrote direct to the Home Secretary at Delhi. If Your Excellency's Government would publish these letters the public would be able to verify for itself the truth of our emphatic assertion that, in spite of the efforts of some highly-placed personal enemies of ours in the contrary direction, we expected an early release, and for that reason did not send for our families from Rampur, and that it was in the circumstances most unlikely that we would have jeopardised our release by taking at the same time "active measures to stir up ill-will against the Government." This brings us to the 24th March last, when we had the first opportunity of meeting the Chief Commissioner of these Provinces and urging upon him the necessity of an early decision. And what transpired in the course of this interview raises the unlikelihood of such folly to utter impossibility and positive disproof.

9. Sir Benjamin Robertson assured us that he had himself nothing against us ; that our conduct throughout the three-and-a-half years of internment within his territorial jurisdiction had been unexceptionable and in every way satisfactory ; that he was merely our jailor to keep us, whom others had judged, in safe custody; that he had throughout acted merely as a

post office, communicating to us the orders of Your Excellency's Government, and forwarding our representations to it, as often as possible with his supporting recommendations; that he had instructed the Deputy Commissioners of Chhindwara and other officers of his administration to show us every courtesy and consideration and not to worry us ; that he was very sorry Chhindwara had been most unfortunate in having had to be placed in charge of so many Deputy Commissioners one after another in bewildering succession, and we had consequently had to deal with such a number of them, few of whom could have had time enough to know us intimately and to settle down into some sort of working arrangement suited to the requirements of all concerned ; that in some cases, he regretted very much, we had been very badly used ; that we should let bygones by bygones, and that he would take up with Your Excellency, whom he was to meet at Khandwa on the 30th March, the question of our release, and, failing that, the sanction of more adequate allowances that could cover the educational expenses of our children, and also the questions of the payment of our recent debts and of our out-of-pocket expenses in connection with our business concerns. This fully confirmed the message which the Chief Commissioner had sent us in the preceding October when he had passed through Chhindwara, and to which we had alluded in the course of our representation to the Committee of Enquiry some weeks later. Happily all this is on record in a letter written by Mr. Mohamed Ali soon after this interview to his brother-in-law and our cousin, Mr. Moazzam Ali, B.A. (Oxon.), barrister-at-law of Moradabad. The Deputy Commissioner, Lieut.-Col. Plowden, would not himself take the responsibility of passing this letter as the censor of our correspondence, but sent it on to the Chief Commissioner, who readily passed it, only requesting that it should not be published, as the interview was meant by him to be a private one.[1] We may add that this desire of Sir Benjamin Robertson has been hitherto most scrupulously respected.

1 On 4 April 1918, Mohamed Ali was told that his letter to Moazzam Ali was forwarded. He was, however, informed 'that the interview granted to Mr. Shaukat Ali and yourself by the Hon'ble Chief Commissioner was a private one, and that details of it are not intended to be published. You should, therefore, instruct your correspondent not to communicate an account of the interview to the press, in case he should be inclined to do so'.

10. This gives us, so to speak, a "clean bill of health" till the 24th of March, and we have now to account for exactly a month that intervened between that date and the 24th April, when we addressed our representation to Your Excellency It would be convenient to divide this intervening month into two periods: the first from the 24th March, when the Chief Commissioner promised to take up our case with you, to the 12th April, when we received a communication from the Deputy Commissioner conveying to us the result of the Chief Commissioner's interview with Your Excellency; and the second period from the 12th April to the 24th, when we submitted our final representation. Now, if it was unlikely that we should have jeopardised our release by "taking active measures to stir up ill-will against Government" between the 8th December, 1918, when the Committee left Chhindwara, and the 24th March, 1919, when the Chief Commissioner left—and we have the Chief Commissioner's word for it that we did not do so—then does it not stand to reason that it is still more unlikely that we should have jeopardised our release by any such action between the 24th March and the 12th April. As for the remaining period of twelve days, we think Your Excellency can safely take it from us that in this brief interval we were too fully preoccupied to take any measures other than the preparation of our long and detailed representation and its submission to Your Excellency.

11. This, we think, fully proves our case. But we can guess easily enough how there came to be made such an allegation against us. To disprove it in another way, we would request Your Excellency to enquire whether it is alleged that we were stirring up ill-will against Government among the municipal population of Chhindwara or abroad. In the latter case, we would request Government to take the public a little more into its confidence and publish unhesitatingly whatever proof of our guilt or "definite information" it has received. We have the best reason for knowing that none exists.

12. But, on the other hand, if this "definite information" relates merely to some measures alleged to have been taken by us "to stir up ill-will against Government" among the municipal population of Chhindwara and within the restricted limits of our residence there—and we have reason to believe

that this is the allegation—then may we not, without offence, beseech Your Excellency to consider for a moment whether people so deeply interested and actively concerned as we are known to be in the world-wide issue of the maintenance of the temporal power of Islam in three Continents, and makling an earnest Imperial appeal to Great Britain, and through her to mankind in conference, could with any degree of plausibility be credited with indulging in a ludicrous attempt to rouse against Government the ire of the infinitely small population of Chhindwara ? We may or may not be guilty of some deep diabolical plot for the overthrow of even so powerful a Government ; but to credit us with such foolishness and futility as to attempt to compass its overthrow by means of "stirring up ill-will against it" in an obscure corner of Gondwana is, we submit with the utmost deference, to insult our intelligence.

13. We, however, suspect for good reasons that it is some such futility that has been attributed to us by some of the local officers of Chhindwara under the guidance of Lt.-Col. Plowden. He is the ninth Deputy Commissioner that we have had to deal with within three years, and had been in charge of Chhindwara for some months when that saintly son of India, and one of the best and shrewdest friends of her Government, Mahatma Gandhi, called upon all his brothers and sisters to observe the 6th of April as the Day of Humiliation and Purification after the passage of the worst of the two Rowlatt Bills in defiance of the united wishes of the country as well as the Council of Your Excellency. Our relations with Lt.-Col. Plowden were at no time intimate ; but during the two months just preceding our removal to Betul jail his dealings with us and with some of those connected with us have been characterised with unconcealed malice, arising chiefly out of wounded official pride when, in spite of all his efforts, the good people of Chhindwara, along with us, fasted and prayed on the 6th April and kept their shops closed. Very little persuasion had been sufficient to induce them to follow the instructions of Mahatma Gandhi, and there was neither any compulsion nor, of course, any breach of peace or other disturbance of any kind whatsoever. The Deputy Commissioner was greatly incensed at the blow thus struck at what he wrongly conceived to be his official prestige, and he is known to have expressed somewhat frantically his views and future

intentions regarding "these jackals," as he called the office-bearers and members of the local Home Rule League, and even remonstrated with an Hon. member of the C.P. Legislative Council because, like us, he had subscribed to the fund now being raised to assist Lokmanya Tilak in meeting the costs of his recent litigation against Sir Valentine Chirol.

14. The first indication of his consuming anger against us was given when, after a most perfunctory enquiry on the spot, not lasting beyond a few minutes, he hastened to announce then and there his refusal to the closure of an insanitary lane adjoining the beautiful Juma Masjid that was nearing completion under our supervision. It was being used by the passers-by practically as a public urinal, and the smell was most offensive. The chairman of the Municipal Committee, Rai Saheb Mathra Pershad, O.B.E., and several other members had inspected the lane, when the Muslims had applied for the closure, and when, after a personal inspection of it, the Civil Surgeon, Capt. Windross, had strongly urged the closure, the Municipal Committee had applied for it to the Commissioner of the Division. The matter had been pending for several months when the shops were closed on the 6th April. Soon after that Lt.-Col. Plowden gave a short notice to the people concerned that he would himself inspect the place, and, as we have stated above, he announced the rejection of the application on the spot after the most cursory enquiry. What is still more significant, he testily inquired of us what possible interest we had in such a local matter, either being ignorant of—which is surprising—or pretending to ignore the fact patent to all that it was we who had taken a prominent part in collecting locally a very large sum of money for the reconstruction, and had been wholly responsible for the architecture.

15. A more direct indication of his grudge against us was given when sustained efforts were made that a retired Government clerk, who was awaiting the grant of a pension, and had been practically the only shopkeeper who for obvious reasons had kept his shop open on the 6th April should launch a prosecution against Mr. Mohamed Ali, because the latter had vainly appealed to him to express along with his fellow-townsmen the grief felt at the passage of the Rowlatt Bill and close his shop also. We understand that, in spite of much

official pressure brought to bear on him through a local magistrate recently awarded a title, even this retired Government servant refused to take part in such a false and malicious prosecution. It appears that when this effort proved sterile of the desired result, Lt.-Col. Plowden attempted to turn even failure into some sort of a success, and, making a virtue of necessity, wanted to lecture Mr. Mohamed Ali on the enormity of his conduct and the generosity of his own in letting the matter go, no further than a warning privately administered, and, of course, duly recorded on the confidential file of the unfortunate interned ! Mr. Mohamed Ali was on the 15th April requested to call on the Deputy Commissioner, which at first he readily agreed to do. He, however, requested Lt.-Col. Plowden to intimate to him the nature of the business, so that, if it concerned us both, Mr. Shaukat Ali, too, could accompany him. This the Deputy Commissioner declined to do, and did not wish the two of us to visit him together. Having had painful experience of interviews of this sort, and preferring to deal with the Deputy Commissioner in writing, of which a record could be preserved for reference when needed, Mr. Mohamed Ali declined the invitation. Had the business been of a *bona fide* nature, there was nothing to prevent the Deputy Commissioner from committing it to writing; but after this we received no letter from him, and were we not assured from his conversation with some local men of prominence of his determination to cause us further trouble, we would have concluded that after this the incident was closed.

16. But clearly enough that was not the case. We understand that soon after that he motored over to the summer headquarters of the Local Administration, presumably with a view to have further restrictions imposed on our already restricted liberties ; and this view is supported by the Press *communique* issued by Your Excellency's Government, stating that "the question of taking steps to prevent these activities was under consideration" when our representation to Your Excellency was submitted on the 24th April.

17. But the immediate result of Lt.-Col. Plowden's visit to Pachmari was an order of the Local Administration dated the 24th April, externing under the Defence of India Act our friend Mr. Azim-ud-Din Khan of Rampur from Chhindwara, where

he had been carrying on business independently of us for a number of years prior to our transfer to the place in November, 1915. Laterly he had been living with us and looking after our children's education and our household. He had taken an active part in persuading the people of Chhindwara to observe the Humiliation Day, and had in the evening addressed a public meeting of the citizens, at which he moved a resolution supporting the demands of the Muslim League with reference to the Khilafat and the Holy Places of Islam. It is clear that when the Deputy Commissioner could not induce the Local Administration to add to the restrictions already imposed upon us without the orders of the Government of India, he procured the orders of externment from Chhindwara, within 24 hours, against our friend, whose name, too, he did not then correctly know, as the order addressed to "Azizuddin Khan" clearly goes to show, and of whose activities, objectionable or otherwise, he must presumably have been still more ignorant. Obviously he had intended to punish us, even if it was only vicariously, and he unloaded his chagrin on the first man connected with us that was within his reach.

18. But apparently he was not yet appeased. Mr. Azim-ud-Din Khan left Chhindwara immediately on our advice, although he could have contested the validity of applying to him an order addressed to another. He awaited for a couple of days in the neighbouring town of Seoni the arrival of Mr. Shaukat Ali's children, whom he was to accompany home to Rampur. Naturally, while there, he stopped with our nephew, Mr. Sadiq Ali, who lived at Seoni, and was assisting a prominent forest contractor, Mr. Khurshed Ali and also gaining experience of business for himself under an experienced and successful friend. We had placed him there early in March, when we expected our release any moment. But the Superintendent of Police at Seoni wanted Mr. Azim-ud-Din Khan to be immediately sent away from Seoni also, although the order of externment was limited to Chhindwara, and though Mr. Azim-ud-Din Khan left Mr. Khurshed Ali's house, where Mr. Sadiq Ali used to live, and stayed in a mosque, so that the forest contractor should not be made to suffer on our account the consequences of official displeasure, this did not prove enough. Mr. Fairweather sent for our friend and urged upon his notice that "the climate of Seoni was unhealthy." Understanding the real purpose of his remarks,

even though Mr. Fairweather had not the courage to put it into plain language, Mr. Azim-ud-Din Khan left the place for Jabalpur, to await there the arrival of Mr. Shaukat Ali's children. Shortly after that the local Deputy Commissioner brought pressure to bear on Mr. Khurshed Ali to send away our nephew, Mr. Sadiq Ali, also, and when the latter saw him personally he was told that he would not be allowed to work at Seoni, as he was our nephew and had once or twice visited us at Chhindwara. In order to involve Mr. Khurshed Ali in no trouble on his account, or rather on ours, our nephew left Seoni immediately, even before he had sold off the timber and bamboos that he had recently purchased for his own business, All this is on record, as we were compelled to complain of this to Sir Benjamin Robertson, when all efforts to appeal to the conscience and sense of justice of the Deputy Commissioner of Seoni had failed.

19. The last to suffer as the result of Lt.-Col. Plowden's wounded pride and chagrin have been ourselves, and this is the entire truth of the Government's receiving "definite information" in April, 1919, that we were "taking active measures to stir up ill-will against the Government". Your Excellency, a political detenu is fair game for all; and four years of internment have fully confirmed our experience that under the present system of administration if the head of the district is determined to harass anyone living within his jurisdiction, he can effectively do so, and where a confidential record is being maintained, as in our own case, and it can increase without our knowledge from day to day both in bulk and blackness while we sleep of nights and quietly pass our days, then certainly the district officer can work his will without let or hindrance. But whatever quarrel we have, it is with the high Imperial authorities; and we have always wished to avoid all friction with local officials. It is therefore most painful to us to have to overload a representation dealing with the gravest matters of our faith and the public policy of Government in relation to world-politics with petty details of the harassment and vexation caused to us by a local officer.

20. But there is another aspect of the matter no less surprising than painful. We have before this been the victims of the malice of certain highly placed personnel and political opponents of ours among the officials ; and we know some-

thing of the extent to which they have come in the way of our release more than once, by referring to forged letters alleged to have been ours inviting foreign potentates to invade India, or by pretending to be absolved of all responsibility for the safety of the realm if we were set free at least before peace had been signed. That at least flattered our power at the expense of our liberty. But we certainly did not expect that a Deputy Commissioner would figure so prominently among those who would deprive us of the little liberty that even the Defence of India Act had spared to us, and that among the Reasons of State for the determination of the Governor-General in Council would be the fact that partly through our persuasion some petty shopkeepers in these backwoods had, without doing harm to anybody in the world, closed their shops also on a day observed in a similar manner in many places in India, and in most of them on a much more imposing scale.

21. We now come to the contents of the representation submitted to Your Excellency on the 24th April, a summary of which has been attempted in the Press *communique* with very misleading brevity. But before we re-state the religious obligations imposed on us by Islam, and the universally cherished sentiments of Indian Muslims, regarding the subjects dealt with in our representation, we have to point out the many inaccuracies regarding its proscription, printing and circulation with which the *communique* is unfortunately replete. It is manifestly inaccurate to state, as Government has done in the *communique*, that "surreptitious attempts were nevertheless made to print and circulate it among leading Muslims in India and to publish it in the Press" *after* the document had been proscribed by the Government of India. As a matter of fact it was not the Government of India, but various Local Governments, that had, or under the Press Act could have, proscribed the document; and it is equally manifest that even they could not have proscribed it by applying any section of the Press Act until and unless it had already been printed. So much about the printing of the document *after* the Government of India's proscription. But there was nothing in the least surreptitious, whether about the printing or the circulation and publication. We have never liked to do things clandestinely, and we submit with all deference that

we resent this accusation more than anything else. The whole of our record is before the Government and the public, and we are astonished that after the signal failure of our enemies to attribute to us the authorship of the treasonable letters to which we have referred above, these attempts to ascribe underhand dealings to us have not yet ceased. Nothing could better demonstrate our desire to do everything in the broad light of day than our openly apprising the Chief Commissioner on the 9th May that, for reasons clearly set forth in our letter to him, we would not thenceforward regard ourselves as bound by the orders of internment. It is manifest that if we desired to do things surreptitiously, we could have done so without notifying to the Local Administration by letter, and to the public of Chhindwara, in the presence of a magistrate and a police officer, in the course of speeches in the mosque on the same day, that we considered ourselves free, but would for the time being continue to live with our people at Chhindwara as quietly as before. As for the compliment paid in the *communique* to the Press for not publishing the proscribed representation, we submit it could not effectively console it for the wholesale application of the Press Act to it, against which the Press Association has recently sent long cables to the authorities in England. If any credit is due for the non-publication of our representation in the Press of India, it is due rather to the Act that hangs like the ever-present sword of Democles over its devoted head.

22. We now come to the statements made in the *communique* that :

> "Since the opening of the Frontier campaign indisputable proofs have reached Government that the brothers are making every effort to induce the Muslims in India actively to assist the Amir of Afghanistan against the King-Emperor."

In view of the fact that the Government claims to be in possession of the originals of some of the letters that we addressed to various important personages in India as well as newspapers and private individuals, we feel considerable surprise that, instead of publishing them in full, it should have published the briefest summary of their contents which is inaccurate, incomplete and misleading. We are prepared to stand by any letter that we may have written to anybody, and

we beg Your Excellency to authorise their immediate publication. We are in fact most anxious to admit that we did address "important personages in India as well as newspapers and private individuals". But we most emphatically deny that they are capable of bearing any sinister interpretation, and this would be confirmed when we state that when we were removed to this jail we were about to address His Highness the Maharaja of Bikaner[2] and Lord Sinha in similar terms and with precisely the same object.

23. These letters of ours were neither more nor less than earnest appeals to the important personages addressed in the most open and frank manner to use their influence with Government to discontinue the disastrous policy it had been pursuing with reference to Islam and the Muslims, and to warn it of the danger of another and a more bitter, a more widespread and a more sustained war so soon after the one that was hardly yet over. The personages addressed were without exception those who were in the confidence of Government, whose friendly advice could never be suspect like that of Indian politicians, and if their names are published everyone will be able to draw for himself the obvious inference from such selection.

24. As for the newspapers and private individuals, they were urged not to misjudge the Muslims and to suspend judgement about the outbreak of hostilities until more light had been thrown on these strange proceedings, and the still stranger motives that were sometimes unconvincingly alleged to have prompted them. When so many of our most distinguished fellow-countrymen and organs of the National Press declined to accept as indisputable and correct beyond the possibility of doubt the accounts that they had read about the recent strange happenings in our own province of the Punjab, which is ordinarily so easy of access, and pressed for an independent inquiry into events and their causes, was it fair and reasonable to regard as indisputable and undoubtedly correct all that they read about the still more strange happenings in an obscure country beyond our borders such as Afghanistan? If anything is to be found in our letters inconsistent with this purpose, let the Government by all means publish them, and, when the proper time comes, we shall

2 See pp. 248 above.

request the recipients of these letters ourselves to publish them, if, in bare justice to us, they have not already done so themselves.

"Whatever record leap to light,

We never shall be shamed."

25. But since Government is apparently uninformed about the manner in which our faith colours and is meant to colour all our actions, including those which, for the sake of convenience, are generally characterised as mundane, one thing must be made clear, and it is this : Islam does not permit the believer to pronounce an adverse judgement against another believer without more convincing proof ; and we could not, of course, fight against our Muslim brothers without making sure that they were guilty of wanton aggression, and did not take up arms in defence of their faith. When so responsible an authority as the Secretary of State for India, speaking from his place on the Treasury Bench in the House of Commons, while initiating the discussion on the Indian Budget on the 22nd May, could frankly confess that His Majesty the Amir's "motives are doubtful", and that "they must be partly attributed to the unrest which exists throughout the Mohamedan world", then, we submit, no apology is needed from two believing Muslims, who are most poignantly suffering on account of their love of Islam from the same "unrest" in their long-drawn exile and incarceration, if they entreat their fellow-countrymen, now happily united, to suspend judgement and not heedlessly rush to hurl anathemas against a far less powerful, though brave Muslim neighbour, who could not be reasonably suspected of so foolish an enterprise as an attempt to subjugate India. Some of the most sacred regions of the Khalifa's Empire have been wrested from his possession and Indian soldiers, including unfortunately many Muslims, who thereby jeopardised their salvation, "had a predominant part in the defeat of Turkey", as the Secretary of State for India readily admitted : and yet, on the same admission, they are a prey today to "perturbation and perplexity" and, speaking for himself, Mr. Montagu said that he "cordially sympathised with the causes of their perturbation." Now our position is this. Without better proof of the Amir's malice or madness we certainly do not want Indian soldier's including the Muslims, and particularly with our own encouragement

and assistance, to attack Afghanistan and effectively occupy it first, and then be a prey to more perplexity and perturbation afterwards, and leave it to us to add one more appeal to the many already made, so frantically and so utterly helplessly, for the evacuation of Muslim territory, and for sparing the remnants of the temporal power of Islam.

26. To make the position once for all clear to Your Excellency's Government, we recapitulate below what we feel and what we have both publicly and privately expressed :

(1) During the war Muslims have been required, in defiance of their religious obligations, to assist Government in waging war against the Khalifa and those engaged in *Jehad.*

(2) The *Jazirat-ul-Arab*, or "Island of Arabia," which includes Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia, and which Muslims are required by their faith at all times to keep free of non-Muslim occupation and control, is at present occupied and is being controlled by the forces of Great Britain and of some of the Allied and Associated Governments in defiance of the Prophet's well-known testamentary injunction.

(3) The Holy Places of Islam, which are not particular buildings merely, but territories, including the three sacred *Harams* of Mecca, Medina, and Jerusalem, are no longer permitted by Great Britain and the Allied and Associated Governments to be occupied, defended, and served by the Khalifa, who is their only accredited Servant and Warden ; and one of these, viz., Palestine, is already promised away to the Jews.

(4) The dismemberment of the Empire of the Khalifa; the appointment of non-Muslim mandatories to control various portions of it; and the consequent weakening of the temporal power of Islam to the point of danger to its spiritual influence through the possible pressure of the temporal power of rival creeds, is being openly advocated.

(5) Discrimination is being made against Muslim Governments and populations in various other ways also, e.g., by excluding Muslim Governments from the benefits of the League of Nations, and by denying Self-Determination to the Muslim populations of territories forcibly annexed or occupied and controlled by non-Muslim Powers.

(6) While this has been going on, Muslim opinion, unrepresented at the Peace Conference, and represented before the Allied and Associated Governments by unrepresentative Muslims, is being vigorously suppressed in India by means of the Press Act, the Defence of India Act, and, latterly in the Punjab, by the declaration of Martial Law.

27. In view of the foregoing, we have earnestly appealed through Your Excellency for the abandonment of a policy so prejudicial to the best interests of this composite Empire with a hundred million Muslim members. If, in spite of this, the pursuit of such Imperial policy is not discontinued at an early date, and Islam and Muslims continue to be as relentlessly persecuted as before, we shall *then*, and *not otherwise*, be compelled to conclude that India is no longer safe for Islam. When we have been forced to such a distressing conclusion, we must unflinchingly apply to the situation the well-known Islamic formula which has been openly preached and practised for more than thirteen hundred years. As we stated in our representation to Your Excellency, when a land is no longer safe for Islam, a Muslim has only two alternatives : *Jehad* (Holy War) or *Hijrat* (migration) : and in the absence of power to initiate a *Jehad* with reasonable hope of success, as in our own case, a Muslim who values his eternal salvation above all else must seek safety for his beliefs and practices in migrating to some other and safer land. And this, if we are compelled by Government, we shall reluctantly have to do. This is only a repetition in brief of that which we have stated clearly enough and at considerable length in our representation of the 24th April to Your Excellency, and for this we have ample authority in our religion.

28. When that representation was submitted we knew nothing of any trouble on the Frontier, and, in fact, it had, on the contrary, been broadcast that His Majesty the Amir had issued stringent intructions to his officers on the Border not to give asylum within his territory to refugees from the Punjab. Even when, a fortnight later, we wrote to the Chief Commissioner that we would no longer regardourselves bound by the order of internment, we had little to go upon except some conflicting rumours; and it was a day or two later that we read Your Excellency's message communicating the news about the outbreak of hostilities. Since then we have

strictly maintained the only position an Indian Muslim could take up in the circumstances consistentlywith his duty to his creed and his duty to his country.

29. In the presence of the magistrate and the police officer who used to attend the Friday service at the mosque, we more than once made that position clear. If, said we, the Amir desires to enlarge his dominions at the expense of our inoffensive country, and seeks to subjugate its population that has never wished him ill, then we not only do *not* advocate assistance being given to him by Indian Muslims, but we will most zealously advocate and lead the stoutest resistance against such wicked and wanton aggression. This is precisely what in September, 1917, we had told the Raja Saheb of Mahmudabad, who had visited us at Chhindwara and had referred to the possibility of foreign aggression: and he had thereupon wired to Simla to Mr. Jinnah, apparently for communication to Government, that he was entirely satisfied about our political attitude. We do not want a change of masters, but we do want the speedy establishment of a Government responsible to the united people of India, and we hope we have made the matter clear beyond the possibility of any doubt or misunderstanding.

30. But if, on the contrary, the Amir has no quarrel with India and her people, and if his motives must be attributed, as the Secretary of State has publicly said, to the unrest which "exists throughout the Mohamedan world", an unrest with which he openly professed to be in cordial sympathy; that is to say, if impelled by the same religious motive that has forced us to contemplate *Hijrat*, the alternative of the weak, which is all that is within our restricted means, His Majesty has been forced to contemplate *Jehad*, the alternative of those comparatively stronger, which he may have found to be within *his* means; if he has taken up the challenge of those who believe in force and yet more force, and he intends to try conclusions with those who require Muslims to wage war against the Khalifa and those engaged in *Jehad*; who are in wrongful occupation of the *Jazirat-ul-Arab* and the Holy Places; who aim at the weakening of Islam; discriminate against it; and deny to us full freedom to advocate its cause; then, the clear law of Islam requires that, in the first place,

in no case whatever should a Muslim render anyone any assistance against him; and, in the next place, if the *Jehad* approaches any region, every Muslim in that region *must* join the *Mujahidin* and assist them to the best of his or her power.

31. Such is the clear and undisputed law of Islam; and we had explained this to the Committee investigating our case when it had put to us a question about the religious duty of a Muslim subject of a non-Muslim Power when *Jehad* had been declared against it, long before there was any notion of trouble on the Frontier, and when the late Amir was still alive. Your Excellency has only to send for our replies to the Committee's questions to assure yourself that this is no newly improvised doctrine of our own, but one as old, and as well known, as Islam itself.

32. One thing more has to be made clear, as we have since discovered that the doctrine to which we shall now advert is not so generally known in non-Muslim and, particularly, official circles as it ought to be. A Muslim's faith does not consist merely in believing in a set of doctrines and living up to that belief himself; he must also exert himself to the fullest extent of his powers, of course, without resort to any compulsion, to the end that others also conform to the prescribed beliefs and practices. This is spoken of in the Holy Quran as "Amal bi-l-ma'roof" and "Nahy' an-il-munkar"; and certain distinct chapters of the Holy Prophet's Traditions relate to this essential doctrine of Islam. A Muslim cannot say: "I am not my brother's keeper", for in a sense he is; and his own salvation cannot be assured to him unless he exhorts others also to do good and dehorts them against doing evil. If, therefore, any Muslim is being compelled to wage war against the *Mujahids* of Islam, he must not only be a "conscientious objector" himself, but *must*, if he values his own salvation, persuade his brothers, also, at whatever risk to himself, to take similar objection. Then, and *not* until then, can he hope for salvation. This is our belief as well as the belief of every other Muslim, and in our humble way we seek to live up to it; and if we are denied freedom to inculcate this doctrine, we must conclude that the land where this freedom does not exist is not safe for Islam.

33. It was in pursuance of this divine injunction, and in humble imitation of this practice of our Holy Prophet, on

whom be God's benedictions and peace, that we made the speeches, and wrote the letters, to which the Press *communique* alludes, though its summary of our opinions and their expression is, as we hope we have now made quite clear, both inaccurate and incomplete, and, therefore, misleading and unjust, both to ourselves and to our faith. Let the Government publish all our letters in full, and thus place the public in a position to pronounce a correct judgement. If this is done, we shall be entirely satisfied. If anything inconsistent with this statement of ours has been attributed to us by those who are noted for their hostility to us, then, we finally state that it is absolutely without any foundation. It is not of the further punishment to which we have been subjected under Regulation III of 1818 that we complain. For that, and for worse, every true believer must ever be prepared. It is of the suppression of some of the most important elements of truth, and the publication of a garbled version of our views, and of a misleading description of our activities, that we complain; and that, too, because Government has publicly claimed to be in possession of those views and of proofs of those activities, and has yet hesitated to place them before those in whose eyes it seeks to justify its own extraordinary action with regard to ourselves. For everything that we have done or advocated we have clear and indisputable authority in our religious books, and we could not certainly remain silent without jeopardising the salvation of our souls.

34. As Government is aware, we were determined to seek redress in the law courts against the proscription of our representation by several Local Governments as soon as the proper courts had re-opened; and most of the foregoing points would then have been placed before them and openly discussed. But before the courts re-opened we were incarcerated, and, contrary to all justice and all precedents, our application to the Judicial Commissioner of Nagpur to appoint a Special Bench, under the Press Act, to hear and determine our application to set aside the order of forfeiture, has been withheld by the Local Administration. This is such an amazingly complete and effective denial of justice as well as freedom that we shall not attempt to characterise it any further for fear of being once more accused of the use of intemperate language.

35. In connection with the latter charge, we would submit that it has always been far from our intention to be in any way disrespectful to anyone, however humble, and we could not have consciously erred in this respect in submitting a representation to one in Your Excellency's pre-eminent position. But we nevertheless hold that on every occasion only such language should be employed as would effectively indicate what the writer feels and desires to convey; and if Government only knew what passes under the brain-caps of our perturbed and perplexed people, it would not accuse us of using intemperate language; but would, on the contrary, believe what is but the barest truth, that we exercised considerable restraint in expressing what millions upon millions of our distracted co-religionists have been feeling, without discovering any safe outlet for their feelings. And while expressing, as we must, our recognition of what is due to the Supreme Government, may we not beg Your Excellency to recognise what we and a hundred million subjects of His Majesty have at present at stake ? After all, it is for the greatest stake that an individual or a nation can have on this earth; and the claims of Truth outweigh by a good deal all other claims.

36. The Press *communique* also accuses Mr. Mohamed Ali of having abused certain Muslims in the course of a speech delivered in the Chhindwara mosque on the 30th May. We fear Government has either misunderstood what has been reported to it, or has been misinformed by the local officers. We have no desire to abuse anyone, Muslim or non-Muslim, and a mosque is surely not a place where a Muslim with any pretensions to live up to his faith would indulge in such un-Islamic conduct. The fact is that Mr. Mohamed Ali only traversed the statement of the Secretary of State for India in his Budget speech, that he and two other Indian delegates had discussed the Islamic question "assisted by three representative Indian Mohamedans" with the Council of Four. We have no desire to indulge in personalities; but if it is sought to ascribe a value to a person's opinion which it does not merit, merely on the ground of his personality, then clearly the laws of polite controversy permit a discussion of his personality as well of his opinion, with a view to demonstrate that his personality is not entitled to throw any additional weight into the scale. Now the three eminent gentlemen who assisted the Secretary

of State and the delegates of the Government of India did not represent the vast majority of Indian Muslims; and the opinions of such of them as have publicly expressed them do not at all coincide with the requirements of Islamic law and universal Muslim sentiment. We have, in fact, to guard more against the advocacy of some of those...who profess to speak in favour of Muslim claims, than against the insensate bigotry and prodigious earth-hunger of those noted for their hostility to Islam and the Muslims. Of the three who accompanied Mr. Montagu to Paris, [Ameer Ali] and [the Aga Khan] are not of the Sunni persuasion which believes in the Khilafat, but belong to two different branches of the Shia Ismaili sect, recognising, instead, two rival sets of Imams. [Abbas Ali] is no doubt a Sunni; but he had not previously shared the sentiments of the vast bulk of Indian Muslims with regard to Turkey, and cannot, on his previous record, be said to be a true representative of Indian Muslims with regard to the questions before the Allies. Nobody would be more relieved and more genuinely pleased than ourselves if these eminent gentlemen have now come to realise the tremendous force of Islamic law and Muslim sentiment behind the demands formulated by the All-India Muslim League and elaborated by us, and we pray that they may truly represent the Muslims of India in their advocacy and, strictly following the dictates of the law of Islam, attain the success that such an advocacy richly merits. But even optimism has its dangers; and Mr. Mohamed Ali, far from abusing anybody, explained the above facts, mainly with a view to their being duly reported to Government by the officials present in the mosque.

37. The only person to whom any reference was made in connection with the condemnation of His Majesty the Amir, as the *communique* statesw as [the Aga Khan] who had just then arranged some sort of a demonstration of Punjab *Pirs*. To those who know anything of the way in which [the Aga Khan] lives, such a combination is bound to appear bizarre to a degree,and to carry its condemnation on its own brow. And we maintain that if people appear in such ill-assorted company, no one has a right to object to an exposure of their strange doings, least of all a Government which claims to be neutral in religious affairs and to favour no class or party. If in grave religious and political affairs of this kind a person like [the Aga Khan] is to be free to rush in, then no one else should be made to fear to tread.

38. Even the old law, which is the negation of all laws, under which we are now detained in a prison, and which was executively enacted in far different times, and should, therefore, have been repealed long ere this, recognises the great likelihood of errors of judgement on the part of officers administering it who are unused to adjudicate on the guilt or innocence of persons, and are all the more likely to err in the case of persons condemned on unsifted allegations and *in absentia*. We are, therefore, entitled to hope that Your Excellency will be pleased to revise the grounds on which you determined to incarcerate us without having recourse to any judicial proceedings. If our submissions, which have assumed greater length than we would have wished, mainly in the interests of clarity, are taken into consideration, and if Government has no desire to force people's conscience, then we are certain of immediate release. But it is not mainly with a view to secure that this representation is submitted. Once more we earnestly appeal to Your Excellency to do justice rather to our distracted people. Indeed, we are willing to suffer still greater hardships ourselves if only justice is done to them. But we beg your Excellency to believe that we are not unmindful of the claims and interests of this great Empire; and it is because we are fully convinced that its safety and progress are bound up with justice to all the communities that comprise it, and that its interests will be very poorly served indeed by allowing a hundred million Muslims to suffer an abiding sense of injustice, that we beseech Your Excellency not to miss this great opportunity of removing all traces of such a sense in the only manner in which this can effectively be done. With Islam and India contented, this Empire can rest assured of steady progress and continued prosperity. But if this new settlement of the affairs of the Muslim world is based on force and the right of the victor to crush the one for the time being vanquished, then Your Excellency may take it from us—and we do not say it by way of threat—no Muslim will henceforth know rest nor will he indeed give rest to another. If in giving expression to our apprehensions we have done even the slightest wrong to Government, we are at all times prepared to humble ourselves as those in error must ever be ready to do. In fact, we pray we may have been greatly in error about the views and intentions of Great Britain and her Allies and

associates, and that we may have deservedly suffered in consequence of our error, rather than we may be proved by events to have judged the drift of Imperial policy rightly, and may hereafter have the satisfaction of having been true prophets of coming evil. In that case, the suffering after all would be only ours; and we shall surrender and bow the knee to Truth. But if, on the other hand, our apprehensions materialise, and Islam and Empire both suffer from a disastrous and easily avoidable antagonism, it will be but a poor sort of consolation to us to say we had told you so. The future is before us; and the past has enough guidance for us all. May the God of all wisdom teach us all to act justly and righteously, and grant us the courage to retrace our steps if we have wandered away from Truth and the higher wisdom.

Assuring Your Excellency of our readiness at all times to serve the best interests of the Empire while serving God and following His Prophet.

Shaukat Ali,
Servant of Ka'aba
Mohamed Ali,
Servant of Ka'aba.

State Prisoners under Bengal Regulation III of 1818.

Forwarded through the Superintendent, Betul Jail, to the Deputy Commissioner of Betul and the Hon. the Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces and Berars.

Shaukat Ali
Mohamed Ali
Servants of Ka'aba,
State Prisoners.

Betul Jail, 9 July 1919.

77. Diary : 15-21 July 1919*

Betul Jail**
15 July 1919

Ever since the announcement (18th Sept. '18) that a Committee composed of Abdur Rauf and Lindsay (Judicial Commissioner of Oudh) had been appointed to inquire into the case of our internment the idea that we may soon be released had once more been revived. But our hope lay elsewhere and we kept an open mind about the new move. Gandhiji had written to Shuaib that he had been corresponding with Sir W.M. Vincent about our release.[1] He had taken our case in hand ever since the Calcutta Congress (Dec. 1917) when he had asked Moazzam, Shuaib and 'Sindhi' that I should write to him explaining the purport of our reservation (about obedience to Allah's commandment ranking first with us and full religious freedom) in the undertaking given on the 7th Sept. 1917 to Abdul Majid (C.I.D. Dy. Supdt. and emissary of Sir Cleavland (Director of the C.I.D.). Before writing to him in the form in which he wanted me to follow we wanted him to understand our religious point of view, as we did not desire to sail under false colours. So Shuaib saw him and when he had fully explained our religious obligations he sent word to us that Gandhiji had understood and appreciated their binding force and we could write the letter. I think I did that in February

*This manuscript at the Zakir Husain Library, Jamia Millia Islamia, does not form part of any collection. The manuscript has a note from the Supdt. of Betul Jail saying that 'Certified that this register contains 395 pages only'. Mohamed Ali wrote in response (on the first page) on 15 July 1919 (16 Shawwal 1337 A.H.) "why have they taken the trouble to certify the number of your pages and why do they call you, dear book, by the ugly name of 'register'. Even a State Prisoner may have some private possession of his own, and you are of course my own. You are not meant for the eyes of strangers and they needn't pry into your pages. You will not interest them. My body is theirs. But you belong to the soul."

**On 8 June 1919, the Ali brothers were taken to Betul. Benjamin Robertson assured William Marris : 'I am taking steps to have the whole crew of relations and hangers-on sent away from the C.P. There may possibly be a squeal over this, but we want to get rid of them from this part of the country'. Home Poll. A, September 1918, 406-428, NAI.

1 Gandhi to Shuaib Qureshi, 24 September 1919, *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, vol. 15, pp. 51-52.

1918, tho' I doubt if Govt. 'passed' that letter. Nevertheless Gandhiji was aware that it had been written. It appears that he spoke to Vincent at Delhi in April '18 when they had assembled there to discuss the steps to be taken to meet the "Eastern Menace". Vincent spoke to him rudely enough in all conscience (*sic*) and said that it was no time for bothering about the detenus. They were already sufficiently worried about the War and the turn it had taken and spoke tauntingly about Gandhiji's recruiting efforts (How could G. reconcile recruiting with *Ahimsa* ?). In the informal discussion at Claude Hill's house Gandhiji had alluded to the exclusion of such leaders of public opinion as Tilak, Mrs. Besant and ourselves from the Conference and when he could not get the Govt. to include the four of us he decided to keep away from the meeting on the 27th.[2] Subsequently, after the Viceroy had invited him to a private interview after the first sitting on the 27th (wh. G. didn't attend), G. attended the next day's meeting and seconded a resolution.[3] He had seen Maffey in the previous March and to his astonishment found that M. who had always told him that he wd. be disappointed if he urged our release, now himself favoured it and promised to suggest it to the Viceroy. In July Gandhi wrote to Vincent about us[4] and the latter tried to explain away his rudeness to G. at Delhi and mentioned something about a Committee of Inquiry. But when of all the Indian Judges of the various High Courts they selected Rauf to sit with Lindsay on the Committee it was clear to everybody that whatever else would be done to us, it wouldn't be *justice*. Rauf (with little Ibn-i-Ahmad) had developed into a fearful toady. When he met me at Aligarh (after the League Council meeting at Lucknow in December 1912) when he had seen for himself how *affectionately* the whole community had, against its own wishes, taken my appeal to refer the Muslim University question to a plenipotentiary deputation named by me and accepted the Resolution that none dared to move and all appealed to me to

2 Gandhi to Claude Hill, 26 April 1918, *ibid.*, vol. 14, pp. 371-372; also, to J.L. Maffey, 27 April 1918, pp. 373-374.

3 Gandhi to Maffey, 27 April 1918, *ibid.*, p. 374 f.n. 3.

4 Gandhi to William Vincent, 27 July 1918, *ibid.*, p. 508. For subsequent correspondence on the release of the Ali Brothers, see enclosures below.

put before the so-called Foundation Committee meeting (*including* the Great Aftab*), Rauf tried to flatter me and said thenceforward I was *the* leader of the community. (The flattery could not disguise his malice and jealousy, and I treated his remark as a bit of sarcasm, wh. he thereupon assured me it was not). But when a few months afterwards Sim and Tyler of Kanpur had the Machli Bazar Mosque pulled down and Meston, weak and insincere, screened the very people who had practically defied him by anticipating his withdrawal from the position previously taken up, and a struggle between the prestige of God and Islam and the prestige of the bureaucracy commenced, Rauf was practically the only Muslim Barrister who did not go to Kanpur to assist Mazhar** in fighting the case. (Even Aftab I believe had gone and Shafi—always wanting in courage—pretended that only a bad cold prevented him from leaving Simla for Kanpur). Thereafter Rauf was Meston's pet and he and Ibni and even a man like Abdul Hameed Khan (Khan Bahadur' to Govt. and "Turkey" on account of his red face to the Aligarh Boys) were constant visitors at Govt. House, Allahabad. (No bureaucrat had ever sunk so low as Meston...[Illegible] Rauf's hostility was open and unashamed thereafter, and more so in Aligarh affairs where alone a packed body of Life Trustees—Aftab's pets and nominees and the worst of toadies—could flatter his malice by making him one of the majority against us. It was to this that after our internment he referred to in his letter to Hakim Barham of Gorakhpur (which I got from Ansoo*** in the original of which I got photographs taken when he was appointed a member of the Committee).

20 July 1919

He said Aligarh was safe except for Khwaja Majid and Tasadduq Sherwani ; two four *chelas* as he called them. They opposed him because he, Rauf, had always worked to the end that our *zehrila shar* [evil influence] should be removed from Aligarh or from the League, and Father of Liars !—in this he had succeeded ! It appears that Nawab Abdul Majid (who

*Aftab Ahmad Khan.
**Mazharul Haq.
***Mukhtar Ahmad Ansari.

was the rival candidate and no better than Rauf as Rauf rightly said in his letter to Hakeem Barham) or some of his relations got hold of these letters of Rauf (there were two and it is believed that Hakeem Barham parted with them for "valuable consideration") and promptly published them in the *Musawat* of Allahabad (the paper of Nazeer Ahmad, brother of Zahur and of the party of Nawab Abdul Majid). This was an excellent electioneering move of theirs; for apart from all our personal friends (who now found out Rauf if they had not done so before) the Muslim voters generally were shocked by the malicious reference to two Muslims who were suffering for their people's sake and who were unable to twist Rauf's tail owing to their internment. I am told the people of Kanpur and another place whom Rauf had mentioned as *entirely* in his favour eventually voted solid against him, the landslide being due to the publication of his letters. In his second letter Rauf had stated there was now no chance for Nawab Abdul Majid. But the result showed that he had counted the chickens before having hatched his eggs and he was beaten. Such was the man they had chosen from among the Indians and Muslims to do "justice" to us ! Justice Rahim (Madras High Court) had deeply offended the bureaucrats of Simla and elsewhere by his honest advocacy of Indian claims in the Public Service Commission. But there was Rafiq of the Allahabad High Court and he had been an official for ever so many years, whereas Rauf has had "reward" for serving Meston only a little while ago in the shape of an officiating appointment in the Chief Court of Lahore. He had been designated for the bureaucracy on the death of Shah Din (and if the *Searchlight* of Patna is to be believed, it was *after* the judges of that wonderful Court had seen him and thoroughly satisfied themselves that he would not disturb their "harmony" and the peculiar "traditions" of their Court). Our first impression, when they declined to give us the evidence against us, and delayed for weeks even a statement of charges, was that the Committee was appointed *merely* to whitewash the bureaucracy's dealings with us and to shut up Gandhi. G. was also alive to the character of the Committee and was indifferent as to the result of its "investigations". But he wanted us to go before it nevertheless. We had arrived at that conclusion ourselves

independently and had urged that we should be permitted to appear before it, when it seemed doubtful even if this would be allowed ! But towards the end of September 18, when the Govt. of India overruled our objection to Rauf (in the usual secretariat manner, "Govt. sees no reason" etc.—as if it *ever* saw "reason") and...[Illegible] explained that the object of the investigation was to see if the restrictions could be removed or relaxed now, even if found by the Committee to have been originally imposed for good or sufficient reason, we came to think that the Committee had been privately given to understand that it was expected to justify the internment, and even its continuance after the duration of Sept. 1917, but to report that we should now be released. This would have whitewashed Hailey, Craddock, Meston, Cleavland and all (including Abdul Majid of the C.I.D.) and also satisfied "clamour" (including the most inconvenient of saints Gandhi !). The charges did not arrive until the 13th November, 1918 (two months after the appointment of the Committee and 6 weeks after they had been promised). And when they did come, they were the *ridiculous mus* which the mountains had laboured to bring forth. The vaguest and flimsiest allegations without any particulars, as to time, place or person. Fearing that very little time would be given to us to prepare our written statement, Shaukat had drafted one in advance on the subject of the *Khuddam-i-Kaa'ba* society—the only public activity of his that could have possibly been placed to the wrong side of his account by the officials (how much on the right side on the *Yaum-ul-Hisab* [Day of Judgement]. I was also induced to draw up a statement about my political and journalistic activities and the vain efforts of Clevaland (when he was in England in October, 1913 and I had gone there with Wazir Hasan) to get me to join the party of Curzon. Hewitt, Craddock and the Civil Service were generally against Hardinge, my refusal having resulted in the final breach with the bureaucracy. I had written out something of the kind in a representation to be submitted to Hardinge at Mahmudabad's request—and not because I hoped for anything from that "Diplomat") wh. Hemingway's (DC at Chhindwara, March to June 1916) unauthorised detention of it prevented its being printed before Hardinge left India (April 1916). I prepared a draft out of that and the judgement of Lord Shaw of...

[Illegible] (Privy Council Minority judgement) in the case of Zadig, a naturalised German interned in 1915 and Morley's letter to Minto, incorporating all the orders issued against us and the episode of Clevaland's "undertaking" and our reservation. C.R. Das had, like a good fellow, come over for a consultation from Nagpur in October, after having appeared in Narayan Rao Vaidya's case. But since there was no statement of charge yet, no consultation was possible in a legal sense. I had, however, read to him what I had drafted in anticipation, and he was of the opinion that the tone was too outspoken for the officials here, and that a free and frank exposition should be reserved for the Secretary of State (if ever we are to apply to him) when the Govt. of India refused to do us justice. I agreed and awaited the charges. The first bit of information we got about them was from Slocock when about the 12th November 1918[5], he passed through Chhindwara. He invited us to meet him at Circuit House and we found him with his inevitable companion [Illegible] but pleasant to talk to, something like an "Alfanso" in the apt phrase of Ali Imam's eternally youthful father. He told us that there were heaps of extracts from the *Hamdard* and some from the *Comrade* on which our internment was passed. (And this is the great C.I.D. that people dread so much). So it seemed—and afterwards it proved to be correct—that they had given up their own...[Illegible], the letter to the late Amir inviting him to invade India, and the letter to Maulana Abdul Bari Saheb (I wonder whether a counterfeit coiner would refuse to accept his own manufacture if tendered to him as legal tender). And in spite of all his malice and absence of scruples, Sir Clevaland could "discover" nothing better than *Hamdard* extracts to prove our "guilt". However, Slocock too seemed to have been impressed by the flimsy character of these "charges" and said he believed this would be the last time that we met and heartily bade us goodbye. On the 13th the charges came to us. We awaited the arrival of the Committee on the 16th Nov. (as Slocock told us then would come on that date,

5 They had earlier met on 25 March 1918 as evident from the letter of G L. Corbett. He wrote to Mohamed Ali. 'Mr. Slocock is here for the night; and if you and your brother would care to come round this evening, I think it would be interesting to both of you to meet.' Corbett to Mohamed Ali, 25 March 1918, MAP.

although Corbett had told us on his return from Nagpur that they were coming on the 1st Nov.). We hoped we would learn something more definite from them than these "charges"—at any rate what exactly they wanted us to do to assure them of our "innocence". But probably on the 20th or 21st we heard from the officiating DC (Sitaram R. Pandit, Rai Saheb and a typical "Chota Saheb" as the Civil Service has made these hardworking and "useful" *Public* servants) that the Committee wanted to know when our representation, if any, would be submitted. We wired back that we awaited their arrival to begin work and in reply heard that they would start *after* receiving our representation. It was then that I began drafting our representation with respect to all the charges except those relating to...[Illegible] which Shaukat's representation already drafted had fully covered. But there was no time to "draft" anything. I had only five days left out of fortnight permitted. And Shaukat was impatient. He was so disgusted with the whole farce of an inquiry that he wanted very curt and short replies to the various charges. I was tempted for once to be...[Illegible]; but this was practically to follow the advice of Horniman (as expressed in the *Chronicle*) and of Omar* in his letters, namely to let the Committee well alone as it did not set out to do justice and could be trusted to do injustice unassisted by us. I therefore entered into details and volunteered every bit of information on any and every vague allegation contained in the statement which could possibly throw any light on the matter. I set out to supply all the data on which the "prosecution" could base its case and then to disprove our "criminality". Shaukat was proving more and more impatient. The typists were either unpunctual or incompetent, and generally both. Two Muslims, however, did their best and when Moazzam (my clerk who had for over a month wanted to come and had now been wired for) was free from "fairing" Shaukat's representation, I was assured that the representation would be ready in time. These three typists were constantly "fed" by me and some three or four others were put on to type extracts from the *Comrade* which were to accompany my representation.

*Omar Subhani.

21 July 1919

On the last day there was not even time for scribbling the "draft" and passing it on to the typists without further revision or correction, and so I set down at about 12 noon to finish that representation on the typing machine itself. This was done by 3.30 A.M. or after 15 hours work (which includes a couple of hours for meals and prayers). The extracts were posted the next day, and as there was time, I sat *through* one more night and arranged a *precis* of them to assist the Committee in case it did not care to go through so much "stuff". Ghaffar[6] had been anxious to come and I availed myself of his assistance (as one of the old Subs. of the *Hamdard*) to select extracts from the *Hamdard* to show its innocent nature. So sure was I that nothing to which even the C.I.D. could object would be found in the *Hamdard* that I didn't care to see of the extracts that Ghaffar had culled and simply "hurled" them at the Committee. There were enough indeed to inundate it with "milk and honey" while the very... [Illegible] that the C.I.D. had extracted out of the file of more than two years was meagre in quantity and just not so bitter to taste. Cleavland, Meston, and Co. could not have mistaken if for "wine" or "vinegar"...[Illegible]. But all this labour was of little use. For all that the Committee seemed to care not a line need have been sent to it. However, it did appear that I had anticipated all their "searching" questions that they must have prepared for the "oral examination". Hardly a single question was put to us on the matters dealt with in the representation when on the 6th they examined Shaukat (separately—and I was not even allowed to be present to take down notes, tho' how any secrecy could have been preserved without locking Shaukat up overnight I can't imagine) for some hours and myself for another 7 on the 7th December. (On the 8th they left for Allahabad). The only questions they asked us which were not *definitely* covered by our representations were two and a third that was covered by mine was deemed to be of sufficient importance not for being cross-examined on, but being asked again for any further explanation that we cared to offer. This last was about the real purport of the reservation in C.I.D. "undertaking" brought by Abdul

6 Qazi Abdul Ghaffar (1888-1956); see Hasan (ed.), *Mohamed Ali in Indian Politics*, vol. 1, p. 315.

Majid. Both of us explained it in our respective turns and I read out to the Committee from what I had drafted previously in anticipation of the "charge sheet". This was in fact the first question put to me, and I took over an hour in making sure that there was no loophole for the Committee to escape through. Of the other two important questions one related to our knowledge of Taufiq Bey, Member of the Turkish Parliament for Baghdad (who had met me at Bombay when I was there on the 4th July 1913 to receive Ansari and his Medical Mission on their return from Turkey), Hafiz Wahbi (against whom Fuad was so furious and about whom a Foreign Dept. man told us that he was found in Mesopotamia and then produced in his reference a letter from General Maxwell,...[Illegible] in Egypt to prove that he was *their* man!).*

*The diary ends at this point.

78. Enclosure 1 : Gandhi to O.S. Ghate*

Bombay
31 January 1919

I was glad to receive your letter although it is a doleful one. I was wondering why I did not hear from you. My eye is fixed on Ali Brothers. I am simply waiting for the results of the Government inquiry. Nothing should be done until the Report of that Committee has been presented to the Government. Is the inquiry over ? If as a result of the inquiry the Brothers are not released the time for action will have arrived. The responsibility for taking such action as will be necessary I know rests on my shoulders and if I am at all well I shall not allow a single moment to pass in taking action and from the present state of my health I have every reason to hope that within a month's time I should be able to take [Illegible] work

*Personal Collection. The photocopy of the original letter is in Mushirul Hasan, *Mohamed Ali : Ideology and Politics* (Delhi, 1981).

if it becomes necessary. My medical adviser expects me to take fully three months rest outside India after he discharges me. But for the sake of this work I should certainly forego the three months rest. I agree with you that the new bill for the preservation of internal tranquility is damnable and no stone may be left unturned by us to kill the measures. But I strongly feel that because of its very severity it will never become law. I think that all the Indian Members of the Imperial Council will strenuously oppose it. But all this is no reason for the country not taking up vigorous agitation. I am myself preparing to do my humble share in it. I am watching its course. There is no fear of its immediately becoming law. There will therefore be ample time to direct and develop the strongest possible agitation. In any event I would like the Brothers to keep absolutely clear of the agitation until they have gained their full freedom. I shall hope that they will take no action without consultation with me.

79. Enclosure 2 : Gandhi to Ghate*

The Ashram
Sabarmati
16 February 1919

I have your valuable letter. I have telegraphed to you saying that I had already written to the Home Member inquiring about the Govt's decision. I passed that information on to Shuaib sometime ago and I thought that in due course it would filter down to you and our friends. At that time Mr. Desai was not by me and I restricted my correspondence as much as possible. At the time I wrote to Maffey I said also that in the event of an unfavourable reply the fight must go on. I was then under the belief that my health would in a way permit of my undertaking that activity. Unfortunately it has become like a pendulum swinging to and fro and just at the present

*Personal Collection.

moment there is again a setback and the doctors tell me that I dare not undertake any exertion for three months. I am however trying to speed recovery and I still hope that by the time I receive the reply from Delhi I would be ready for work.

Your letter gives me a greater insight into the Rowlatt Bills. I detest them entirely and for me the Reforms will be useless if the measures are passed. I am carefully watching the progress of events in the country and feel sure that the brothers need not as yet take any steps about them. It is heart-rending the domestic losses they have suffered. There is hardly a family left in India that has not lost some dear ones. One's feelings almost becomes blunt when the same news comes from everywhere with merciless regularity.

80. Enclosure 3 : Gandhi to Maffey*

Sabarmati
20 February 1919

As I am not still quite out of the wood regarding my health and as, if am to obey doctors' orders, I must not undertake any activity requiring considerable exertion, I thought I would refrain from such activity till I was better. But the events that have recently happened impel me to submit the following for His Excellency's Consideration.

I feel tempted to write about the Rowlatt Bills, but I am checking myself for the moment and awaiting the course of the Bills and the agitation about them in the country. I wish to confine myself today to a matter that specially interests me—the case of the Ali Brothers.

You will recall that I made a submission about them on the New Year's day of 1918. Though the Viceroy may not feel inclined to interfere in the matter of the Ali Brothers, he should know the present position from the popular standpoint.

After the exchange of the final letters between us, I entered into correspondence with Sir William Vincent. The result

*Home Poll. A, July 1919, 1 & K. W., NAI.

was that a Committee to advise the Govt. about the Brothers was appointed. This Committee has duly reported to the Govt., but so far as I am aware, although nearly two months have elapsed after the submission of the Committee's Report, the Government's decision has not yet been pronounced. I wrote to Sir William Vincent about it on the 12th inst. I have been informed on behalf of the Brothers that from the manner in which they are being treated in the matter of their requests for visits to certain places for urgent business and other circumstances, they infer that the decision is likely to be adverse to them. I have read most of the correspondence between the Brothers and the Committee. I have read the communication embodying the charges against them. I have read their reply. I must assume that the memorandum of charges supplied to the Brothers was exhaustive. The impression left upon my mind is that the Brothers have been interned and subjected to numerous hardships without the slightest justification. The charges in my humble opinion did not warrant action under the Defence of India Act. I submit that under a free Govt. they would hold in it a prominent position instead of being treated as a danger to it. They are brave, perfectly straightforward, they are out-spoken, God-fearing, and able men, commanding the respect alike of the Muslims and the Hindus. It would be difficult to find throughout India better specimens of joint Hindu and Muslim culture. In a position which to them is exasperating, they have evinced wonderful self-restraint and patience. Their very virtues seem to have been regarded as an offence. They deserved a better treatment.

I must disclose one fact to Lord Chelmsford although it hurts my sense of modesty. They have ever since the meeting of the Muslim League at Calcutta in the December of 1917 implicitly accepted the advice I tendered to them, and so have the leading Muslims, who would, but for my advice, gladly have carried on a powerful and embarrassing agitation long ere this. I advised them that if relief was not granted, satyagraha—I abhor the expression "passive resistance", as it very incompletely expresses the grand truth conveyed by the easily understood Sanskrit word "satyagraha"—should be resorted to. I assured them that I was in communication with the Govt. about the Brothers' release. As a satyagrahi, I told

them that before engaging in a public agitation about it, we should know the Government side of the question, and we should exhaust all milder remedies and be able to demonstrate to the satisfaction of impartial observers the untenability of the Govt. position before embarking on satyagraha in which, once it is undertaken, there is no turning back. I feel thankful to the Brothers and to the gentlemen, with whom it has been a privilege to be associated, that they have abided by my advice, though the delay has almost reached a dangerous point. I do most earnestly trust that the Govt. will, by releasing the Brothers prevent a powerful agitation in the country.

I shall anxiously await your reply.

I trust you are enjoying the best of health and it would so please me to learn from you that Lord Chelmsford is keeping good health in spite of the great strain under which, I know, he is working.

81. To Benjamin Robertson*

Jail, Betul
Central Provinces
4 November 1919

As desired by you, we submit as briefly as possible the following points on which we request the early decision of the Governor-General in Council :

1. We submit that our detention, which has already lasted 4½ years, has been wholly undeserved, and that we should now be restored to full freedom. We have already submitted on the 9th July last a very full representation to the Governor-General-in-Council through you; but no decision thereon has so far been communicated to us. We would not like to repeat the submissions made therein; but we may submit that if our detention in jail is punitive, we should be given an open and fair trial by a properly constituted court of law. If, however,

*Home Poll. B, January 1920, 493-502, NAI.

it is not punitive, we submit we should be informed on what events our release depends.

2. If for any reason we are not to be restored to the fullest freedom just yet, we should be transferred to Rampur for the cotton season, after which we may be brought here, so that we may earn something in the meantime for the maintenance of our families. If we are released later in the year when the cotton season is over, we shall have nothing on which to maintain them.[1]

3. Even if this is not for any reason possible, we should at least be allowed to visit our mother, whose health has broken down, and to remain with her till she gets well. At her time of life (she is 70) and in her present state of mind, the slightest ailment is naturally a source of grave anxiety. We, therefore, trust immediate permission will be accorded to us to proceed to Rampur.[2]

4. If we are not to be released just yet, nor to be transferred to Rampur, our families should be permitted to reside at Betul and visit us at convenient intervals.

On account of our business as well as our mother's health, time is a great consideration to us just now. We, therefore, *submit that reference may be made to the Governor-General-in-Council* by wire, and his decision also communicated to us by wire; and in case we are permitted to proceed to Rampur, arrangements may be made here so that our departure is not delayed on account of delay in receiving the necessary sanction for payment of travelling expenses or on any other account.[3]

Shaukat Ali
Mohamed Ali

1 This request was put forward several times, but was consistently refused. In December 1917 the Ali Brothers pressed for a transfer to Rampur unless Government accepted liability for the financial loss they sustained. The Government, however, refused to accept any liability for any losses as their detention was 'legal'. See Home Poll. D, September 1918, 25, NAI. Also, see f.n. 2 in Mohamed Ali to Slocock, 29 January 1917 above.

2 The Government of India accepted the local Government's view that 'short visits of the brothers to Rampur were undesirable for political reasons, especially at the present time.'

3 The following notes to the representation may help to understand the official mind :

82. From Abdur Rahman Siddiqi

c/o Thomas Cook & Son
Ludgate Circus
London EC 4
5 November 1919

I am sure my letter from either Aden or Port Said has reached you by now and given you the news that we have "gone West" (literally of course not idiomatically). After a very dull voyage we reached Marseilles on the 21st of September and crossed over to Boulogne by the Bunbay Express and reached Folkestone on the night of the 22nd at 9.30. Then by Express to London at 12.40 in the night. Had dear old Habib[1]—Khaliq's cousin—not been there I don't know how we would have spent that first night of ours in London. Well we spent the next day in London which was a Sunday and on Monday after paying a visit to Thomas Cook started for Cambridge at 4.30 P.M. We had to go there as firstly Habib was there spending his

Any relaxation of the rules at present will embarrass the United Provinces or the Central Provinces and therefore should not be agreed to.

C.W. Gwynne,—17-11-19

I should like Director, Central Intelligence, to see. The longer we keep these men in, the harder I feel it to refuse them some measure of sympathy; but on the other hand the reasons for continuing to restrain them have yet lost little of their force.

W.S. Marris,—17-11-19

I agree with Mr. Gwynne's note. I do not think it possible to allow any relaxation until after we know the effect of the Turkish peace terms.

C. Kaye,—21-11-19

Home Poll. B, January 1920, 493-502, NAI.

1 Mohammad Habib (1895-1971) was the son of a leading Lucknow lawyer, Mohammad Nasim (1859-1953), and brother of Mohammad Wasim and Mohammad Mujeeb, Vice Chancellor, Jamia Millia Islamia, Delhi. He was a noted historian of medieval India, having worked with distinguished historians in Oxford. He was professor and head of the department of History for many years.

vacations and secondly we had to deposit Farid[2] (Doctor's nephew) and Sharif (Chaudhry Shafiquzzaman's son) there. The next day we started for Oxford and lodged ourselves in 9[illegible] Southmoor Road. Then began a veritable hunt for lodgings and for 11 days we wandered and wandered to fail most ignominiously at the end. That is why you see the name of a hotel at the top of this paper. When we had been settled a bit we started efforts at admission. Through Mrs Naidu we obtained the support of a great man Prof. Gilbert Murray.[3] He tried Christ Church and Exeter and failed. Then we tried New College and succeeded in getting our applications placed before the fellows. No room. After this we got a bit upset and the idea of going and studying in London did not appear very shining. Well as a last desperate move we thought of going to Arnold's assistant here and Mr. Burrows[4] incharge of the Oriental Delegacy and asked him to get us admitted as non-Colls. Will you believe that where Gilbert Murray had failed Burrows succeeded ? He said we should first have a shot at all the colleges and then think of the Non-Coll Delegacy. Then Shuaib and I started on a College hunt. We were most rudely and insultingly shown the door by the heads of the Worcester and Oriel and then at last Brasenose took Shuaib and Wadham me. Then we were both matriculated in good time and are now both full-fledged members of this University. But our worries are not over yet. We propose to prepare ourselves for the new degree of D. Phil. started last year at Oxford to keep Americans from going to Germany for the D. Phil. Our qualifications are quite up to the mark and we have great hopes of getting the status of Advanced Students. The Committee has not yet declared its final decision. Shuaib has selected "The Khilafat—its growth and development" and I

2 Faridul Haq Ansari (1895-1966) was a nephew of M.A. Ansari. He was educated in Delhi, Oxford and London; a leading figure in the Delhi Congress Committee and a founder member of the Congress Socialist Party. After independence he was Member of Parliament for many years.

3 He was regius professor of Greek, Oxford (1908-36), and was a noted British classical scholar.

4 This probably refers to Ronald Montagu Burrows (1867-1920), a distinguished archaeologist who conducted excavations at Pylos and Sphacteria and in Boeotia.

have selected the "Reign of Mohammad bin Tughlak".[5] Shuaib will in all probability have to work under Margoliouth[6] and I under Vincent Smith.[7] Once the Assistant Registrar has notified to us his decision we propose to start work and set down in grim earnest until we have done something useful. In case the Committee for Advanced Studies does not give us the status we have applied for we have decided to go to Paris because London does not attract us and Cambridge would perhaps be just as unkind as Oxford. But do not let me be pessimistic at all.

The worry of this Advanced Studentship and the high rates prevailing here are the only two things that are troubling us. Shuaib and I are given a joint bed-room and a joint sitting which we have to vacate when the manageress takes her meals in it. And do you know what we are paying for them. Three guineas each. Grey flannel trousers which sold for 10/6 formerly cannot be had for anything less than 35/- lowest quality. Socks 5/-, gloves 21/- etc. etc. If you ask anyone to tea you have to pay 1/6. Isn't it killing ?

The weather is now becoming nasty. It has been drizzling for a whole week now and we have not had a glimpse of the sun for days together. It has not yet begun to snow. But the cold is quite bitter. We have every hope to pass through the winter quite cheerfully as we did once before in a still colder atmosphere.

The Indian leaders in England are reported to have created a very bad impression and all of them have quarelled with each other. Even the moderates have flown at each other's throats. Rumour has it that after Montagu has seen through his Bill he proposes to repeal the Press Act, the Rowlatt Act and there is going to be a general amnesty for internees. I don't believe any of these things but it has come from quite

5 Mohammad bin Tughlaq reigned in Delhi (1326-1357) as successor to Ghiyasuddin Tughlaq (1321-1325) and was known for his four 'ambitious projects', including the transfer of capital from Delhi to a new city, Daulatabad (Deogir).

6 David Samuel Margoliouth (1858-1940) was Laudian professor of Arabic at Oxford (1889-1937). Among the works he authored were *Eclipse of the Abbasid Caliphate* (with H.F. Amedroz; 7 vols.. 1920-21).

7 A well-known historian of ancient and medieval India. His famous Work was on *Akbar : the Great Moghul*, published in 1917.

respectable quarters. No prospects of the Turkish Peace till summer next. Amir Faişal,[8] the representative of the King of the Hejaz, has been disowned by both England and France and is wandering over Paris like a neglected orphan. He wanted Syria and France has got it. He wanted Palestine and England has got it. The Egyptian troubles are not over yet and we had telegrams of riots in Cairo and Alexandria and the consequential firing and machine-gunning only three days back. Labour is up in arms here as well in America. Soviet Russia has thrown back the armies of Yudenitch and Denikin in spite of British armies and warships. With all those troubles how can the Supreme Council in Paris think of the Turkish Peace. And then President Wilson is still in bed with his curious illness over which there has been so much controversy in the press of the world. America has not yet ratified the Peace Treaty with Germany and she does not seem to be in a mood to accept the mandate for Turkey. Constitutional lawyers are burning the midnight oil—shall we say wasting the midnight electric current—over the problem of America's not ratifying the Treaty. It comes into operation once the three powers ratify it. Italy, France and England have done so. But there are certain articles in it which can operate only when America joins as she has been specially mentioned in it. The problem is "what shall we do in respect of these articles and clauses if America keeps out. Let us wait and see..."

Now then I have given you a very chatty piece of literature and it is supposed to be written by both of us. Mohamed has to sit down and send us a long long letter of advice as to how we should employ our time here and Shaukat has to send one

8 (1885-1933); in World War, posted first in Syria under charge of Turkish Governor; escaped (1916) to the Hejaz and took command of Arab rebels at Medina; cooperated with Colonel Lawrence and General Allenby in campaign which captured Jerusalem (Dec. 9, 1917) and Damascus (Oct. 3, 1918). After war, proclaimed (Mar., 1920) king of Syria by a Syrian national congress, but deposed by French under General Gouraud (July, 1920). Placed by British (1921) on throne of Iraq (formerly Mesopotamia), this country being administered as British mandate until admitted into League of Nations as independent state (1932). Succeeded by his son Ghazi (1921-1939) who in turn was succeeded by his son Faisal II (b. 1935).

of the most charming letters he has ever written.

Shuaib sends heaps of love to you both and I add mine.

Speech at the Amritsar Congress in 1919*

30 December 1919

I have today with my own eyes witnessed a scene the like of which I have never seen before (Hear, Hear). I see an enormous—I will not say an assembly—it looks like a mass meeting. To whom do we owe all this? Is it not to the great warrior who stopped shooting not for mercy's sake but when the ammunition ran short. (Loud cries of shame). The man while he was coming from Rambagh made up his mind to fire and fired strong. He has fired not only on those people but fired into our hearts. He has created a new fire and out of that new fire a nation of Hindus and Muslims is being created before you today. He has forged a new nation, a strong nation, a nation that will henceforth, God-willing, fear God alone and no man on earth. (Hear, Hear). Mr. President, Sisters and Brothers, I speak not in anger because times have passed when we could be angry. We cannot afford to be angry when we have got to create the destinies of a new-born nation. We have got to think in calmness and to act with vigour. You were passing resolutions here, but unless words have lost their meaning you must not call them resolutions, unless you really 'resolve' to do something. If you put down something on paper, paper means nothing. We

Report of the Thirty Fourth Session of the Indian National Congress held at Amritsar, 1919 (Amritsar, 1922), pp. 78-80. Mohamed Ali delivered this speech soon after his release from prison. On 27 December 1919, the Government of India decided to extend the benefit of amnesty to the Ali Brothers. They were consequently released on 28 December. This was done at the suggestion of the Home Member who considered that their release was desirable 'in order to placate Muslim feeling which would be irritated by their exclusion as contrasted with indulgence shown to Punjab and other political offenders.' See Home Poll. A, September 1919, 406-428, NAI.

are not a Government that can issue paper currency of any value. If you really pass a resolution it means that you, each one of you, man, woman and whosoever votes for a certain resolution makes up his mind or her mind that it is your eternal determination that you will not rest, that you will not leave this place and forget what you heard and talked to each other. The resolution now before you considered in a narrow spirit is a resolution condemning two men. After all, we have had so many tyrants in the world that the condemnation of two such men even in such a great national assembly like this can have very little value unless you resolve within your minds at the same time that you have determined henceforward that you will not tolerate tyranny any longer (Hear, Hear). Sisters and Brothers, I am not a hero (Cries of "You are"), honestly I am a very human person, I have more weaknesses probably than any of you. I may tell you that I have felt the rigours of internment and still more the rigours of prison life although I had not to grind,—and Dr. Kitchlew says that even there he was made a leader to organise the gangs of coolies. But now that I have been released, my brother has been released, and so many Hindus and Muslims have been released, I would make just one personal appeal to you, and it is this. The crow-bars with which you have razed to the ground the bastilles of India, we, those who were prisoners here, those who were rotting in jails, we shall not ask you, nay, we shall not tolerate, if out of those crow-bars you make chains for your own selves. Therefore, whether it is an act of clemency, or you may call it an act of tardy justice, whatever it may be, take it out of your mind entirely when you consider the destinies of India (Hear, Hear). I have known the great Gokhale at one time—God rest his soul. I have been told by men of his own Council that probably throughout his life he never ceased to regret one of his acts, an unkindly act it was, when he consented to the passing of the Press Act in order to get out of internment camps and jails eight Indian patriots. Now I have been a journalist and all this time when I could see the rigours of the Press Act I had before my mind's eye those eight Indian patriots who were released. At first I said, much better let us have the Press Act than those eight men rotting in jail'. Now I think I myself have rotted in jail and I have some right to say to you, let us go back to prison, let my

brother Rambhaj Dutt Choudhury go back to Betul prison, let Lala Harkishanlal go back to prison, let Dr. Kitchlew go back to prison, nay let all be hanged if necessary--I am a diabetic and I would much rather die as an ordinary person than as a very unsavoury diabetic patient; after all we have all got to die. I say, let us rather die and care not for our families, if by being taken away by anything, whether it is an act of tardy justice, whether it is a clap-trap or a camouflage, whatever it is, do not forget, for God's sake, for the sake of this country that you love, do not for that sake, bear this in mind while you are considering the future constitution of this country, where you have to consider the rights not only of many millions now but of the unborn millions (Hear, Hear). Therefore, let us go back if necessary, to prison rather than that you should menacle India and leave India in chains and the liberty of even the meanest Indian taken by a Dyer or a O'Dwyer, a Montagu or a Chelmsford, howsoever exalted he may be (Hear, Hear). I speak not disrespectfully of those men who have authority over us, I speak not disrespectfully of them, I am really by instinct conservative in these matters. I believe in theocracy. That is my sovereign. I say God is my sovereign first. God made me just as free as He made George V. Therefore if any of his servants are going to keep all the rights of free men and free women of India—after all your women have been dragged by the police at the orders of men who did not know where the orders were placed—I say let not Indian rights be merely the sport and plaything of those men who treat the whole thing as a tremendous joke, no matter what happens to us, our families, our friends, and our country. This is my personal appeal to you. We are not here to bend the knee and say free us from jails, free us from prisons, free us from gallows for which we are meant as Vernian. I am not here appealing for that. I am not asking for the freedom of some so that the rest of you may go as bond-slaves. I speak in the name of this country, the liberty of which is dearer than the liberty of the most exalted amongst us. I will go to jail for the ninth time. Let Mr. Tilak be sent to prison for the third time, if necessary. Let me be interned for life-time if necessary. Let Mrs. Besant be interned again or hanged even by the roots of her hair in her old age if necessary. But let Indians be free, let no man

say to an Indian, man or woman, thou art a born slave. (Loud applause)*

*After Mr. Mohamed Ali concluded his speech, Swami Shraddhanand called for three cheers for Mr. Mohamed Ali which were very enthusiastically responded to.

Appendix I

Begum Abadi Bano and the release of the Ali Brothers*

1. Abadi Bano to Subramania Iyer[1]

Chhindwara
4 August 1917

I fear this letter will surprise you a good deal not only because it comes from a total stranger, but also because the writer is a Muslim woman brought up in the old orthodox ways according to which women are seldom supposed to address any communication to strangers, and never to men.

But these are extraordinary times, and things are changing so fast that no one should feel astonished if an old woman like myself addressed, at the sacrifice of a little orthodoxy, a letter to one so universally respected and reverenced as yourself on a subject which fills at present the minds of all.

*Abadi Bano (1852-1924), referred to as Amma Saheba By Gandhi (see p. 117 above) and popularly known as 'Bi Amma' to her countrymen, was a remarkable woman in many ways. Left a widow at the age of 27, she struggled to get her children—Shaukat, Zulfiqar. Mohamed—educated and supported their political activities with a consistency rare among women of her generation and background. This *burqa*-clad woman fought doggedly *for the release of the Ali Brothers and, in the process, became widely* known. Subsequently, she took an active part in the Khilafat movement and figured in the popular song of the period : "So spoke the mother of Mohamed Ali. My son lay down your life for the sake of Khilafat." The letters reproduced here are drawn from the Mohamed Ali Papers at the Zakir Husain Library, Jamia Millia Islamia. They were drafted by the legal adviser of the Ali Brothers, O.B. Ghate.

1 Subramania S. Iyer (1842-1924) was closely associated with the Theosophical Society and was among the founders of the Home Rule League in Madras. He was also a successful lawyer, acting as Chief Justice of the Madras High Court in 1899, 1903 and 1906. He was among the founders of the Indian National Congress and Chairman, Reception Committee of the Madras Congress in 1914. Iyer was active in the movement for the release of Annie Besant.

Old people, and specially old women, are not generally fond of changes; but, old as I am, I welcome those that I see taking place around me today. Indeed it does my heart good to see that the people of this country are now beginning to return to the faiths that moved their ancestors to do good and great deeds, and that we the Muslims, too, are at last finding our way back to that old and unpolluted source of inspiration, namely, Islam.

In the glorious days of our great Prophet (on whom be Peace and God's Benedictions) and in those of his early Khalifas (with whom God was satisfied) we were all free enough to do good, and we the women of Islam also used to shoulder our share of the burden and march along with our men, even to the Holy Wars. It is true that in recent times we have been leading much more retired lives; but, nevertheless, I do not think that we women are at all inclined to shirk today such duties as the changing times may once more require us to perform.

In my own case, God, in His great wisdom, willed it that I should shoulder a heavier burden than ordinarily falls to our share. The sudden and premature death of my husband left me a widow at the age of 27 with six children to bring up and educate, of whom the youngest, Mohamed Ali, was less than 2 years old, besides looking after their property. With a firm belief in the Divine protection of those who struggle to do good, and with the solace and inspiration of my faith, I set to work, and in spite of many difficulties and disabilities, I had my reward when all my sons were at last old enough to enter life on their own account. They no longer needed my assistance; and I could now turn contentedly to such religious devotions as had always drawn me towards themselves.

But when my two youngest boys, Shaukat Ali and Mohamed Ali, were interned more than two years ago, I felt that my place was by their side, though they were now fully grown up men and fathers of families. From the first day of their undeserved internment I have shared their exile and have never regretted it. It is an honour and a privilege reserved only for those whom God chooses for the purpose to suffer discomforts and privations, and even death, in the service of one's faith and country; and I am more than content that my sons were the first to be interned under the Defence of India

Act barely two months after it had been passed. Of my own free will, and even against the wishes of my children, I have decided to share all their sufferings and privations, and to do what an old woman like me can do for my God and my country.

As for Home Rule, for which I have noted, naturally with pride, that it is one of my own sex and age that has worked so earnestly, well, I may claim that for forty years I have been in a very practical sort of way a real Home Ruler; and, judging by results, I do not think I have done so badly. I therefore feel that I have established a right to demand it for my country, and when I heard many months ago that, residing as I did in the Central Provinces, I could join the Maharashtra Home Rule League inaugurated by that good and brave man, Lokmanya Tilak, I, along with my daughter-in-law (Mohamed Ali's wife) and every other adult member of our household, was sworn in as a member. In these days it is not sufficient merely to have a belief. One must openly profess it, and, if need be, proclaim it from the housetop.

I have always felt a great desire to meet our greatly gifted and brave sister Annie Besant, and more so after her very affectionate and cheering letters to my sons during their internment. She was extremely good and kind to them, and used to send them all her publications. Please convey to her our sincere love and affection and assure her and her two fellow-sufferers and lieutenants of our deep devotion to them. I regard it as a great misfortune indeed that I have never met her. My son Shaukat Ali was for several years posted at Banaras as a Government Officer in the Opium Department and met her there; and although I visited him for fairly long periods practically in every station to which he was posted, curiously enough it was Banaras only where I failed to stay with him. However, God willing, we shall meet some day, and in the meantime I continually pray for her. To her in her internment I have nothing but congratulations to offer. The prayers of young and old, Muslims and Hindus, in a United India are with her, and they will make up for all the petty persecutions of a breed of little men which she is now experiencing even as we have experienced them these 27 months.

Beyond my prayers and congratulations I have little to offer to her. But I feel that to the fund opened in connection with her internment I must offer our little mite. We have never been rich, and since the internment of my sons we are decidedly poor. Neither of them is in a position to conduct his business, and, instead of anything being earned, several thousand rupees a year have to be paid as interest alone on borrowed capital. To meet these claims and the daily expenses of a large family, for which my sons' subsistence allowance could not obviously suffice, I have sold off the greater portion of our Jagir, which my husband's father had earned for services rendered to the British during the Mutiny, when, working on behalf of his master, the then Nawab of Rampur, he saved the lives of many of the English residents and officials in Rohilkhand and Kumaon. So long as my children were young and I had to maintain them, I had regarded it as a point of honour never to part with any portion of this property, and so far not an acre of it had been allowed to pass out of our hands in spite of the greatest financial stress. But since it was the internment of the grandsons that in 1917 demanded the sale of the Jagir earned by the grandfather in 1857 I considered myself in a way absolved, and I am not a bit sorry that I have sold such a large slice of it. As for the future, I have no misgivings about my sons and their children. I firmly believe in our Oriental proverb, "*Mulk-i-Khuda tang neest*; *pa-i-mara lang neest* (God's dominions are not within narrow limits; and my foot is not lame). But even today I want our great sister to share our modest pocket money, and I would be greatly obliged if you would kindly accept Rs 10 per month from us. I have sent a money order for the first month and should like to tell you that every member of our household here has contributed something to make up this amount, the children and the servants having pressed their mite with marked fervour..

In this connection I should like to say one thing more. My own sons are young and strong, and have innumerable friends and fellow-workers all over the country who would be only too glad to give any assistance they needed. But my mother's heart bleeds, as I feel sure does my good sister Annie Besant's, for the hundreds of brave unfortunate lads condemned without a hearing, removed from their friends and families,

and deprived, among other things, of their liberty to earn a living for themselves and for those depending on them. My own experiences during the last 2½ years have, as it were, brought it home to me what hundreds of mothers must be feeling today whose homes have been left desolate to them, and still more, what those young men must be feeling who have no mothers to look after their comfort and console them in their exile. One hears every now and then a heart-rending tale of sorrow and privations and dimly realises that there must be many others equally heart-rending that never reach one's ears. Cannot something be done in the way of giving them legal advice and pecuniary help ? Even if these unfortunate men must lose their liberty, why need they and their families that could have done nothing to merit such a fate be left to starve ? Could not our Home Rule Leagues keep some sort of record of every person interned, and not merely of those that are generally known to the public, and see that they are given such assistance as they and theirs need ? I am sure if an appeal was made every household in every part of India would contribute something for such a noble cause, even if it be a handful of grain every day. And our generous and selfless sister Annie Besant rightly deserves the honour that such a fund should bear her name, and I feel it would please her more than anything else if her sufferings and possible privations moved all India to think of those who suffer like her and to provide for their needs. As for her own sufferings, great as they must be, they cannot be unendurable. We women may be physically weak, and may not distinguish ourselves like men in action; but God has in His great mercy given us greater power to love and to bear. And where we love greatly, we also suffer greatly and gladly. These days cannot last long, and there can be but one end. I have firm faith in the words of our Holy Book which have always given courage and comfort to every one experiencing sufferings and suspense : "*Nasr-um-min Allah-i-wa fath-un-qareeb*" (Succour cometh from God and victory is nigh).

God be with you.

2. To Subramania Iyer

Chhindwara
4 September 1917

I am sorry that I am so very late in acknowledging the receipt of your two very kind letters. I have been anxious for some time to write to you and enquire about the health of our sister Annie Besant about which I have heard so many alarming reports. I can well realize what this internment, with all its attending worries and recurring pin-pricks, means to one of her temperament and habits. Why, it would wear away a much younger person.

All the same, she *must* get strong and well. She ought to call to her aid all the Soul-Force she possesses, and I know God in His mercy has endowed her with great faith and spiritual power. In these days of trial how constantly do these words of the Holy Quran come to my mind :

"O ye that believe, seek assistance in fortitude and prayer."

What a beautiful combination, Patience and Prayer ! So rest-giving and powerful ! I am sure my dear sister does not need from any of us such advice. She must have always believed in that, and must have now been relying on the efficacy of fortitude and prayer.

And she ought to feel happy. Are not her efforts bearing fruit ? If she and her brave companions are interned, what does it matter ? Are there not thousands even in the remotest corners of the country that have taken up her work today ? If one Home Rule Flag can forcibly be taken down, would not a thousand new ones go up ? Judging from our own feelings I can well believe that thousands and hundreds of thousands would put up the beautiful Red and Green over their homes, and over their hearts too. Throughout my long widowhood I have never worn colours. But I shall now pin the Red and Green below the honoured badge of the *Khuddam-i-Ka'aba* (Servants of the Ka'aba) on my white *Burqa* or veiled mantle which I wear when going out. It is not out of bravado or show only. It means that one is not ashamed of one's beliefs nor afraid of the consequences of their declaration. To tell you the truth, I feel more sorry than angry at the ignorance

of the people in power who can imagine that such petty show of authority could really strengthen the foundations of Empire. Would that they could come to see these things with our eyes, and learn, what even the women in purdah know only too well, that petty exhibitions of this kind of temper only serve to undermine the foundations of all authority.

Only a few years ago the shouting of "Bande Mataram" an innocent enough, and, in fact a laudable cry, was considered seditious in Bengal, and many a patriot had to suffer pain and undergo humiliation on that account. And yet I am told that all big meetings commence today with the singing of "Bande Mataram" and that the very same brave Bengali youths that used to be punished for the very same words now use them as a recognised battle-cry as they march forth to die, if need be, and for ever wipe out the vile calumny against the good name of their people and their manhood. That ought to teach a lesson to those that forcibly take down Home Rule Flags. I have no doubt that they would one day learn it. May it be that they may learn in time ! The Persian poet spoke truly when he said :

Har chi dànà kunad kunad nàdàn,
Lék bà'd az kharàbi-è-bisyàr !

(All that the wise man doeth, doeth the fool also—but only after a world of mischief hath already been done !)

Kindly tell my sister that though no prophet or soothsayer, I feel certain that, God willing, she and I would see Home Rule established in India before we die. But if God wills that we must leave this world before our heart's desire was fulfilled, then we will cheerfully and thankfully obey His will and will be glad to face our Maker, happy in the belief that perchance our earnest efforts for the cause of our faith and our people and for suffering humanity may make up for our deficiencies in other respects, and He in His great goodness may grant us grace and pardon. We "strivers in the path of God" can only do our best, and must leave the rest to Him...*

*In the subsequent paragraph, Abadi Bano laments the untimely death of Ghulam Hussain and regrets that Mohamed Ali was denied permission to visit his friend's family when they required his help most.

I have sent you today a money order for Rs 10 as our second monthly instalment towards the Besant Fund. I was rather surprised to learn from Mohamed Ali that he was asked by Government a number of curious questions about my letter to you, and the most curious of them was the question how it came about that I could afford to contribute as much as Rs 10 a month to the Besant Fund ? Evidently my letter to you was not carefully read. One who had only recently sold a portion of the family *Jagir* for Rs 40,000 mainly to pay the liabilities of her sons at the rate of some Rs 15,000 a year during the last two years of their internment, could surely afford to contribute such a small sum out of the sale proceeds, nor should the saving of ten rupees a month out of the expenses of a large household, by the giving up of some little "luxury", appear so extraordinary, specially when it is remembered that it is for a cause so dear to our hearts. In any case, my own poor share was so small that I blush to name it, and the sum of Rs 10 was made up of the mites of no less than 26 persons, big and small, who mean them to be the token of their great love for our dear and greatly oppressed sister and their devotion to the country for which she lives and works. But I suppose these things must continue a little while longer, and we must endure them.

God be with you all.

3. Abadi Bano's Account of the visit of the C.I.D. Deputy Superintendent to Chhindwara*

My sons and I have received in the course of the last fortnight a very large number of telegrams from all parts of India, from public men and public bodies as well as personal friends and relations, congratulating us on my sons' release and inviting them to various centres of public activity, and latterly, just as in the early part of the fortnight, enquiries have poured in on

**New Era* (Lucknow), 6 October 1917.

us requiring confirmation of the general belief that my sons' release had already been ordered...

To begin with, I must explain that up to the time of issuing this statement no orders have been received by my sons cancelling the orders interning them here and restricting their liberties in various ways; and as by the terms of these orders they are prohibited from publishing anything without the previous sanction of the Chief Secretary to the Chief Commissioner of these Provinces, I have taken it upon myself to issue this statement.

The first intimation that we received here that the release of my sons was under consideration was conveyed to us in the following telegrams from their affectionate and chivalrous friend Mr. B.G. Horniman, the editor of the "Bombay Chronicle", who had often corresponded with them during their internment...

Till then no offer had been received by my sons from the Government, nor did they know at the time the terms of the Government reply to Mr. Jinnah's question regarding Mrs. Besant and her two lieutenants and to his supplementary question regarding my sons in the Imperial Legislative Council on the 5th September. Soon after perusing this telegram, which, though handed in at Bombay on the evening of the 5th September, was not received here before the morning of the 6th, and was not made available to us by the Censor before mid-day, the following reply was forwarded by my sons to the Censor with a view to obtain his sanction for transmission :

"Your telegram. Thanks. We have received no offer ourselves. Never unconstitutional or violent, we have always been God-fearing Muslims and law-abiding, lovers of our country, and always desire and hope to be. We place our people's fullest freedom above our own, and confident that our friends would never wish us to prejudice that, we always welcome their counsel. But we cannot feel any joy at our own release if God-fearing and valiant patriots like Mrs. Besant, Hasrat, Azad, and Abdul Wali Khan here at Betul are not also released.

This telegram was, however, referred by the Censor to the Local Administration, which, after some days, refused to permit its transmission...On the morning of the 7th September, however, a very significant incident happened. Mr. Abdul Majid, Deputy Superintendent of Police (C.I.D.), who had arrived from Simla, called on my sons at our house here, and under instructions from Sir Charles Cleveland, Director of the Criminal Intelligence Department, showed to my sons the form of an undertaking initialled by Sir Charles Cleveland which, as he informed them, the latter desired them to give. It ran as follows :

> I shall abstain during the remainder of the war from doing, writing, or saying anything intended or reasonably likely to encourage or assist the enemies of the King-Emperor. I shall also abstain from doing, writing, or saying anything intended or reasonably likely to be construed as an attack upon the allies and friends of the King-Emperor. I also promise to abstain from any violent or unconstitutional agitation which is likely to affect the public safety.

Explanation—

> The abstentions promised above are not intended to cause me to refrain from participation in politics within constitutional limits. (Sd.) C.R.C.

My sons conversed with Mr. Abdul Majid for some time regarding the nature and scope of the required undertaking, after which Mohamed Ali went to his room to fetch a pen to draft the undertaking that Shaukat Ali and he were prepared to give, and for the first time I learnt from him that they had received an offer from Government. I viewed their conditional restoration to liberty now even more seriously than their loss of it nearly two and a half years ago, and consequently desired to know the conditions on which it was now offered to be restored and their decision regarding that offer. I therefore put on my *burqa* and, disregarding to some extent, under the stress of a great emergency, the custom that prevails among our people, I went to my sons' study where they were conversing with the emissary of Government, and addressed him as nearly as I can now remember in these words :

> "I understand that the Government desires at last to do justice to my sons by restoring them to liberty. Naturally I

rejoice at this, for who can know better than myself what they have had to endure during the last 28 months and what it has cost them to endure it ? But I understand that Government now requires them to give an undertaking of some sort. Well, they are old enough to understand what is to their advantage and what is not to their advantage, and also to understand what is right and what is wrong. They certainly do not need any advice from me today. But I should like you to tell Government from me that they owe me a duty prior to any they may owe to others, for I bore them for nine months and suckled them in their infancy, and our Prophet has told them that their paradise lies under my feet. Knowing, as I do, all that they have suffered during their long exile and internment, I can also understand how hard it must be for them to reject any terms the acceptance of which means the end of all this long drawn misery. But I want Government to know that if in order to escape from their sufferings they will promise anything in the least contrary to the dictates of their faith or the interests of their country, God will, I feel sure, give enough strength to my mother's heart and these palsied hands to throttle them that instant, dear as they are to me and strong and stalwart as they look. For the rest, they have always been law-abiding subjects of the King-Emperor, and in your presence I order them to remain so in the future as well. That is all that I can say, and I would request you to tell Government what I have told you."

After this I was about to retire to my room, but my sons detained me and translated for me the undertaking that the Government required from them and the answer that they were about to hand over to Mr. Abdul Majid for transmission by wire to Sir Charles Cleveland. I have already given the undertaking required and now proceed to give the statement communicated to Government in reply. It ran as follows :

B-ism-i-'llah-i-'r-Rahman-i-'r-Rahim.

"We have always been God-fearing Muslims who accept above all else the commandments of God as conveyed to us in the Holy Quran and the life and sayings of our Prophet. Without prejudice to this faith we have always been law-abiding lovers of our country, opposed to all

unconstitutional and violent methods, and, war or no war, this we always desire and hope to remain. Therefore, we have no objection to give an assurance, if any is still needed, to the effect that without prejudice to our allegiance to Islam we shall abstain from doing, writing, or saying anything intended or reasonably likely to encourage or assist the enemies of the King-Emperor, and from doing, writing, or saying anything intended or reasonably likely to be construed as an attack upon the allies and friends of the King-Emperor, and that we shall also abstain from any violent or unconstitutional agitation likely to affect the public safety. We understand, and base the above undertaking on the clear understanding that the abstentions promised above are not intended to restrict in the slightest measure our freedom to observe all our religious duties as Muslims or to cause us to refrain from participation in politics within constitutional limits."

This statement of my sons' position entirely satisfied me, and I think it should satisfy anybody.

Some time after that we casually learnt that the Raja Saheb of Mahmudabad was coming down from Simla to visit my sons, and that Government had placed the Circuit House here at his disposal. We were naturally under the impression that the Raja Saheb would previously intimate to us the time of his expected arrival: but, as it happened, he suddenly arrived on the night of the 9th September by motor-car from Jabalpur after a rough journey in pouring rain. It appeared that Government did not intend people to know that the Raja Saheb was proceeding to Chhindwara to discuss with my sons the question of their release, but, as in the case of Mrs. Besant, Government required to be satisfied that if restored to liberty they would not resort to unconstitutional and violent methods of political agitation, and the Raja Saheb and Mr. Jinnah were desirous of giving such an assurance. The Raja Saheb conversed with my sons, and being very soon satisfied that they were as patriotic as they were God-fearing he wired to Mr. Jinnah the next morning that he was thoroughly satisfied.

He was under the impression that Mrs. Besant and her two lieutenants and my sons, and probably all other *detenus* also, were to be released on the 12th September, and was therefore anxious to reach Simla by that date. Accordingly he started

on the return journey on the morning of the 10th September, but he had hardly gone eight or nine miles when his car broke down, and he had to return to Chhindwara on a hot noon by a country cart procured with considerable difficulty. When he had kindly come that morning to see me I had apologised to him for the poorness of the hospitality that under the circumstances we could show to him. I did not then know that he was to experience all this discomfort also, and our thanks to him for the efforts made to secure the release of my sons, which would have been great in any case, are on that account all the greater. He finally returned by special train on the night of the 10th September, and I understand that a couple of days later Mr. Abdul Majid, who had been staying here since the 7th, awaiting Government orders, was recalled to Simla.

In this connection I may perhaps mention that it was only after his arrival here that the Raja Saheb came to know that an emissary of the C.I.D. had preceded him and had already made an offer to my sons. At this he showed considerable surprise and also a little annoyance.

After the Raja Saheb's departure nothing was heard for a time. But from the 13th September telegrams have been pouring in upon us expressing joy at my sons' release or anxiously asking for a confirmation of the general belief that it had already been ordered. As no orders were received from Government, nor any authentic news from Simla, I caused telegrams to be sent to the Raja Saheb of Mahmudabad and Mr. Mazharul Haq, and the following replies were received on the 21st of September :

"Mohamed's reply to his friend's note has hampered progress. Trying hard.

MAHMUDABAD"

"No orders yet issued. Have patience.

MAZHARUL HAQ."

Well, after 28 months of internment few could reproach us with impatience, and much as our early return home is necessitated by the affairs of my sons and the health of one of the children, who has had since last May three successive attacks of fever of a most malignant type in spite of the best medical treatment and the most careful nursing, and for whom

the Civil Surgeon insists now on an immediate change, we have called patience once more to our aid, and await God's pleasure, as all Muslims must do. Nevertheless, I thought it my duty to send the following telegram to both these kind friends of my sons:

> "Your telegram. Kindly wire me further developments daily. I order my sons strictly conform Islam.
>
> ABADI BANO."

This is a full statement of the facts, and I trust it would enlighten our friends and relations from whom anxious enquiries are now being received in as large numbers as their congratulations only a few days ago. As I have said before, when my sons are in a position to do so they would no doubt thank all those kind friends whose sympathy has been of so great comfort to them during their undeserved internment and, I need hardly say that I shall add my grateful acknowledgments to theirs. But I should like to express in some measure even now my gratitude to Mr. Ghate, our legal adviser here, and the Secretary of our Home Rule League, who has rendered to me ever so readily and whole-heartedly every assistance of which I stood in need.

Appendix II

Correspondence relating to Annie Besant's Campaign for the Ali Brothers' release

1. Annie Besant's interview with W.H. Vincent*

16 October 1917

Mrs. Besant began by saying that she understood the conversation was private and that anything said would be treated as confidential. I explained that I had asked Sir James DuBoulay to attend as, though she had asked to see me, he was a Home Member.

She said that she had come to Simla because she thought that the position in regard to Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali have been somewhat misunderstood by government.[1] She said that though the brothers naturally regard the Sultan as the *Khalifa* of the Muslims, they do not consider that any proclamation of a *jehad* by him would bind them to fight against the British Government to which they owe allegiance and that this religious allegiance to the Sultan would not affect the temporal allegiance of any Muslim subjects of His Majesty to the British Government. She stated that the addition made to the undertaking suggested to Mohamed Ali, i.e., the reservation about his religious duties was entirely superfluous. She also

*This is a recorded conversation of a meeting between Annie Besant and W.H. Vincent in the presence of James DuBoulay. Home Poll. D, February 1918, 29, NAI.

1 In October 1917, Annie Besant went to Simla, after her conditional release from internment, with the intention of discussing with the Viceroy the release of the Ali Brothers. Willingdon, Governor of Bombay, interpreted the move as an attempt to secure Muslim support 'who hitherto have been indifferent or hostile to her pretensions'. Willingdon to Chelmsford, 28 October 1918, Willingdon Papers, MSS. EUR. F. 93 (1), India Office Library and Records, London.

said that granting that Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali behaved unwisely before the war and before they were interned, they had been for two or three years under restraint, and that even if there was any small risk in releasing them, it was safer to take it than to allow the whole Muslims community to remain in its present excited state.

She further said that if they misbehaved after being released, it would always be open to the government to impose restrictions upon them again and that they would receive no sympathy from her or any of the Hindus, or from the better class of Muslims if they misconducted themselves after release. She said that her only reason for coming up to speak about the matter was that she found it impossible to secure a calm atmosphere for a discussion of the reforms if these two men were not released. She added that if the Government of India were to release them, she thought that His Excellency's Government would have the whole of the Muslims and Hindus behind them. I gathered that she contemplated this support being the more necessary as she expected some very far reaching political changes as a result of Mr. Montagu's visit—changes which might be very unpopular with the European community.

She said that she still wished to see Mohamed Ali and his brother in order to secure from them an unqualified undertaking as to either future behaviour, but she added that if His Excellency did not wish her to go, she would not do so,[2] as she felt that His Excellency had behaved with great kindness to her.[3]

It was pointed out to her that a man who gave one undertaking one day and another a few days later could not

2 'Sir James DuBoulay and I are agreed that this visit should not be encouraged'. W.H.V. 16-10-1917.

3 Annie Besant was released in September 1917. On 28 September she wrote to Abadi Bano, the mother of the Ali Brothers, informing her of the proposed visit to Chhindwara on 14 October. 'Dear Sister', she wrote, 'please tell me if it is convenient to you to put me, or us, up. And will you ask some Hindu friends to take charge of my servant for me, as he is a caste Hindu, and would find it awkward to stay in a Muslim house. I always do this when staying with Muslim friends'. Annie Besant to Abadi Bano Begum, 28 September 1917, MAP. Later the C.P. Government refused permission to receive Annie Besant in Chhindwara. Corbett to [illegible] Ali. 8 October 1917, MAP.

be depended upon. She was also told that the story of the letter addressed by Mohamed Ali to the Amir of Afghanistan had no foundation, but that it was true that Mohamed Ali had gone to Peshawar with Abul Kalam Azad and Ubaidullah[4] and other persons who were directly concerned with conspiracies against the British Government.[4]

She also spoke of some letter said to have been addressed by Mohamed Ali to the Secretary of the *Khuddam-i-Ka'aba* at Lucknow, of which I know nothing. At the same time she was told that there was reason to believe that this *Anjuman Khuddam-i-Ka'aba* society for the protection of the holy places, was purely a political one, and reference was made to the connection of Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali with the pan-Islamic movement and to his pro-Turkish and anti-allied articles in the public press before the war.

It was also pointed out to her that the release of Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali would certainly be made a basis for further requests for the release of Abul Kalam Azad, Maulana Hasrat and similar people, who were directly concerned in conspiracies against the British.[5] It was pointed out that it was more difficult to differentiate between such cases and Mohamed Ali's that it was between her's and that of the two brothers, and the difference between her case and that of Mohamed Ali was discussed. She said, on the other hand, that all her party would renounce Mohamed Ali if he was released and again misbehaved himself even if the government found it necessary to impose restrictions upon him. She was told in reply that he had openly sympathised with the Turks

4 The reference is to Ubaidullah Sindhi, a converted Sikh who had studied at Deoband and worked with German and Turkish agents in Afghanistan to stir up tribesmen against the British on the north-west frontier. He was a key figure in the 'Silk letter Conspiracy'.

5 Maulana Zafar Ali Khan, poet and journalist of Lahore, was one of the early victims of the government's repressive policy. On 12 January 1914, the Punjab Government forfeited the security of his paper *Zamindar*, and in December of that year, he was restricted to the area of his village near Sialkot. This was followed by the arrests of the Ali Brothers in May 1915, Abul Kalam Azad and Hasrat Mohani. In December 1916, Maulana Mahmudul Hasan and his four companions of Deoband were arrested [illegible] taking part in the 'Silk Letter Conspirary', a scheme devised by [illegible] Sindhi and his chief disciple, Mahmudul Hasan, to [illegible] India.

and promoted ill feeling against the King's Allies, and that he was proved to be a very dangerous influence, that the restrictions had been imposed on him when Sir Ali Imam was a member of the Council, that Mohamed Ali was a person of very unstable mind and that any new assurance from him would have little value, and that if he was released he would probably begin again his old campaign. She was also told that we recognised how difficult the position of Muslims had been during the war and that it was believed that the effect of the restrictions placed on the two brothers had been satisfactory in that these restrictions had prevented unrest and agitation. At the same time it was clearly explained to Mrs. Besant that the decision of government in regard to these men had been arrived at by the whole council and that it was impossible for any individual member to say what the decision of the council would be on the case in the future.

In conclusion she said that if His Excellency would like to see her, she would be glad to go and see him at any time, but that if the Government of India were of the same mind regarding Mohamed Ali as they were at the last meeting of the council, she thought there would be little use in such an interview as her real object was to secure the release of the brothers if possible.

She also asked if the Government of India were prepared to give her information confidentially which would satisfy her as to the pro-Turkish attitude of Mohamed Ali. The question of granting or not granting this request was reserved, though I was personally inclined to refuse such information.

2. Annie Besant's Interview with the Viceroy*

As I am partially responsible for the agitation for the release of Shaukat Ali and Mohamed Ali, having, while myself interned, suggested that their names should be joined with ours in the resolutions for our liberation, I owe it to the Indian public to make a [illegible]ment on the present condition of affairs.

*New Era (Lucknow) 10, November 1917.

Since the annulment of the internment orders against my colleagues and myself, I have urged the setting free of the two Muslim leaders at various public meetings, and moved a resolution, therefore, at the joint meeting of the All-India Congress Committee and the Council of the All-India Muslim League. I went to Simla to see the outgoing and incoming Home Members, and though the matter was discussed for over an hour, and they listened with the greatest courtesy to my arguments, I entirely failed to shake them in their conviction that, under the present conditions of the war with Turkey, the liberation of the brothers was inconsistent with the safety of the great interests entrusted to their care.

I am now returning from a visit to Delhi to see the Viceroy, and my experience with him was similar. He was willing to listen to every argument I could urge, and encourage the most complete frankness of speech, but he refused to regard my own case as on all fours with that of Mr. Mohamed Ali. The one was a case connected with the war, the other one connected with civil reforms. The Viceroy and his Council had considered and reconsidered the matter. I was told by one, who is in the confidence of the Government, that they were unanimous in their decision as to their duty. There is no doubt in my mind that their decision is an honest one, and that they would gladly release the two brothers if the war were not at its present critical stage. The *debacle* of Russia has weakened the Eastern front and has encouraged the Germans, and therefore the Turks. The intense, though passive, sympathy with Turkey shown by Mr. Mohamed Ali seems from the Government standpoint, I think, to contain a possible menace, lest it should pass into active sympathy. I may be wrong, but so it seems to me. We, who believe in the thorough loyalty of the two brothers for India, which is to them their motherland, that they would defend against all comers, Turks or unbelievers, can understand that their passive sympathy with their religious Head does not practically sway them in their active sympathy with the King-Emperor and his cause any more than the Roman Catholic, who believes with Austria in the temporal sovereignty of the Pope, would help them in their invasion of his motherland. Religious and political sympathies are sometimes in conflict in these modern days, but the splendid political loyalty of the Muslim

population has never passed across the line into active sympathy with their Turkish co-religionists. But, while we feel this from our constant contact with each other, we can hardly expect the Government to feel the same, for on them not on us, as we have no hand in the Government in India, rests the terrible responsibility of safeguarding even to excess, the cause of the Allies which is India's cause as well. Even the Roman Republic placed a dictator in power during the war for all military matters, though with the cessation of the war they promptly abolished him.

Having failed so far to convince the Government that the release of the two brothers is consistent with public safety, what more can we do ? My advice is to appeal to the law and to take up my own petition to the Privy Council, modified to meet their case, bringing it first to a local High Court and then on rejection to the Judicial Committee on appeal. The petition was drawn by some of the ablest constitutional lawyers in Great Britain, and was regarded as likely to succeed. Why should we not use this most legitimate way of remedying a grievance ? The Defence of India Act, in the opinion of many great lawyers, is unconstitutional, and, if this be so, the success of our Muslim brothers would free hundreds of interned persons. Shall we not take this step as other steps have failed ?

One other consideration arises in this connection, the question of expense. I propose that we raise a fund to meet the costs of the case here and in England, and let the Muslims and Hindus contribute to it. I would gladly act as treasurer if that be wished and if some responsible Muslims would join me in the duty. My legal friend in England would help us there, and there is good hope of success. Lastly, I would urge on the Muslims that this temporary failure, such as it is, must not dishearten us. If the Government were our own and responsible to us, we should accept their decision wholeheartedly, as it is impossible for us to do today when their ears are poisoned by the C.I.D. when the Europeans clamour for restriction and when any step of theirs towards trust in the Indians and true English statesmanship is met by the howls of the Anglo-Indian Press, for whom the Press Act has no terrors. Trust begets trust, and it is idle for the Government to expect full trust from us, unless they show full trust in us.

Meanwhile let us not put off the happier day, now dawning upon us, by any slackening on the part of the Muslim community in the efforts to place India's case before Mr. Montagu, and to win early Self-Government. Their natural irritation should not lead them to refuse to work for the Home Rule, which can alone create an atmosphere of trust and confidence between peoples and Governments. The more they feel that our brothers should be set free the more should they strive to win the freedom which will make such internments impossible in the future, and will enable us to dismiss any Government which, when peace is reached, can be shown to have abused the powers necessarily entrusted to it in the time of war.

3. An Open Letter to Annie Besant*

Chhindwara
11 December 1917

...I now write to express—and that not as a matter of convention—my very deep feelings of gratefulness to you, and my warm appreciation of the arduous labour involved in your two long journeys undertaken at your time of life and in your present state of health to secure the release of my sons. I am sorry that your efforts did not meet with greater success; but that does not affect our indebtedness to you, nor does it alter our firm belief in ultimate victory...

Before your interview with the Viceroy it had not been made clear with which enemy of the King my sons had freely expressed and promoted sympathy; but since it is now clear that it is not the Germans, Austrians, or Bulgars, but only the Turks with whom my sons are alleged to have been guilty of sympathising, I should like to make sure whether Government

*This letter was written in reply to Annie Besant's interview with the Viceroy. This was printed in a pamphlet entitled *Freedom of Faith and its Price*, circulated by Mohamed Ali during his visit to England in 1920 as leader of the Khilafat Deputation.

really understands the position of us Muslims. To me it seems that our position has been entirely misunderstood.

Now my sons have no particular sympathy with Turkey any more than they have with China ; but along with everyone of us who believes in the Holy Quran they have been clearly, emphatically, and repeatedly enjoined to regard all Muslims as brothers and to show kindliness and compassion to them, and none could pretend to be a good Muslim who did not as freely express and promote sympathy with the Muslims of Turkey as with those of India or Persia or Arabia. The last six or seven years have been years of sorrow and suffering for Muslims all the world over, and I am proud to think that whenever and wherever Muslims were found to be suffering, my sons felt for them and grieved with them. The Muslims of Persia, Morocco, and Tripoli claimed their sympathy no less than the Muslims of Turkey proper, and all received it in equal measure, for all were equally Muslim and according to the Holy Quran equally entitled to it. And it must not be forgotten that the sympathy so freely expressed and promoted with the sufferers in the Tripolian and Balkan Wars had not only been countenanced and approved but openly encouraged and promoted by the late Viceroy and all the important officers of Government. It was freely expressed and promoted by my sons not because of any political predilections, but as part of their faith, and nothing has happened since to make the performance of that religious duty today a crime and an offence.

There is, however, one other aspect of the question which must be clearly understood. While all Muslims, wheresoever they may have their domicile, are equally entitled to the sympathy of their brethern in faith, His Majesty the Sultan of Turkey has a unique position of his own. As the temporary sovereign of a part of God's earth he rules over Turkey just as His Majesty the Shah rules over Persia and as His Majesty the Amir rules over Afghanistan. But quite distinct from this temporal sovereignty he enjoys, what the other temporal sovereigns do not, the power and dignity and status attaching to the Khilafat. He is the "Khalifat-ur-Rasul" or successor of our Holy Prophet (on whom be God's benedictions and peace) and as such the "Ameer-ul-Momineen" or the Chief of the Faithful. I am glad to note that our Government at least realises that this religious question is [illegible]

outside the competence of non-Muslims, but of what practical use is this recognition if the best of Indian Muslims are depriv-ed of their liberty for no other crime than that of freely expressing and promoting sympathy, even though it is acknow-ledged to be merely "passive"—whatever that many mean—with the spiritual Head of the Islamic world and with his Muslim subjects ?

I would once more emphasise that sympathy with the Muslims of Turkey and spiritual allegiance to their ruler is not a political creed that each of us is free to hold or to discard without prejudice to his salvation hereafter and which those who retain may have in varying degrees to suit their whims and fancies. It is a religious doctrine which is the essence of our faith and the limits of it are as rigidly laid down as the limits of any other religious doctrine. I am no theologian, nor are my sons ; and in this, as in other matters of faith, we seek guidance from those that are. But this much must surely be known to all Muslims, as it is known to us, that the limits of such sympathy as we are enjoined to show towards our brethren in faith must be uniform and unvarying. Is it a novel doctrine that my sons have improvised to embarrass the Government after its declaration of war against Turkey, or is it part of the faith that was felt to us as a complete and unchanging whole thirteen hundred years ago ? It is this question that the Government must dispassionately consider today instead of relaying upon the reports of ignorant and untrustworthy persons. But this is just the question which seems never to have been considered, or, if considered, Government seems unwilling to abide by the implications of the only decision at which it could rightly have arrived. It is at least admitted that my sons' expression and promotion of sympathy with the King's enemies has been open and free. And since it has not been stated how and when this sympathy has been freely expressed and promoted, it seems more than probable that Government has once more misconstrued the prayers which all Muslims have been offering for the success of the Khalifa and Muslim arms for centuries before the present war, and which for a time the Chief Commissioner of these Provinces desired to prevent Shaukat Ali from offering. A clear statement of the religious position was, however, furnished to him, and the orders against this religious obser-

vance were withdrawn immediately afterwards. If the expression of my sons' sympathy has taken any other form, why has it not been openly stated ?

Whatever sympathy we feel for the Muslims in Turkey, and whatever allegiance we owe to the Spiritual Head of the Islamic world, is part and parcel of our unchanging faith, and cannot, therefore, suffer any alteration. Consequently the distinction that is sought to be made between "active" and "passive" sympathy is to us Muslims wholly unintelligible. And as for intensity of feelings, surely it is reasonable to suppose that the sufferings of our brethren should excite greater sympathy towards them than their security or success, and I cannot see how the "debacle" of Russia, even if it has encouraged the Germans and the Turks, as you say, can affect the sympathies of my sons and their title to the fullest freedom under the law.

Government is, of course, free to make offers of release to my sons and retract them after they have complied with the conditions attaching to them while safeguarding their faith. It might have had some hope of securing thereby a material alteration in their attitude if that attitude had been the outcome merely of a passing political fancy. But suffering such as to my knowledge has been theirs during the last two and a half years, which may well have cured one of a political folly, has only served to strengthen them in their resolve to do nothing to prejudice their ultimate salvation. They could not alter their attitude in this matter in the slightest degree without being untrue to all that they hold most sacred and dear, and, believe me, if ever they did that, I would wish they had never been born. And remember that it is a mother that says this.

My dear sister, I have laboured this point perhaps with wearisome insistence ; but that is only because so far I regret to have to say, I have come across nothing in the public Press—and I am, I assure you, a very close student of it, just now, getting many Urdu papers read out to me every day with a degree of regularity, in spite of the devotional exercises and household duties that leave me very little leisure, and often getting the gist of the writings in the English papers explained to me—I say I have so far come across nothing in the public Press to convince me that our non-Muslim Government has

grasped the essence and truth of our religious position. And I say this more in sorrow than in anger. Our loyalty to an earthly sovereign, be he Muslim, Christian, or Hindu, is strictly conditional on our being given the fullest religious freedom, and as God-fearing Muslims we cannot accept the orders of any secular authority if they conflict with the commandments of the Ruler of Rulers. Allegiance to Him takes precedence of all other kinds of allegiance, whether it be allegiance due to king or country, father or mother, brother or friend, and it seems to me that kings and governments would have but a broken reed to lean upon if they trusted the loyalty of a Muslim who placed it before his loyalty to God. I do not pretend to think that the needs of temporal authority may not sometimes make it difficult and embarrassing for it to tolerate the worshipper's allegiance to their Maker as ranking about the subjects' allegiance to their sovereign, and the history of every religion is full of such instances. But it is just because it may become difficult at times to tolerate this that secular sovereigns should always consider it their duty to acquaint themselves with the innermost religious convictions of their subjects and shaped their course in the light of that knowledge, avoiding most scrupulously every situation in which their subjects' spiritual allegiance may tend to draw them in a direction contrary to their temporal allegiance. Every Government must realise the gravity of the issue when a choice is forced upon the people between their allegiance to God and their allegiance to a man, or a number of men, however exalted. However others may choose, a Muslim could chose only in one way. Much may and should be done for king and country; but no one is entitled to demand from another the surrender of his soul.

It cannot be said that my sons had ever made a secret of their religious beliefs, nor can it be said that in these they differ from other Muslims in India who are now openly declaring that they share the religious convictions of my sons and deserve internment no less if also no more. For years before their internment they had repeatedly explained to Government the implications of their faith and cannot now be blamed for springing a surprise upon the Government. My dear sister, it is a poor sort of statesmanship first to ignore the most sacred convictions of the people, and then to punish them for having

such convictions; and the internment of a few Muslims, even if they be their most beloved religious and political leaders, is poor enough as a punishment if it is intended thereby to turn back seventy million Muslims from the path of their religious duty. For does not each and every one of them hold the faith of their glorious Prophet that "Verily my prayer and my worship and my life and my death are for Allah, the Lord of the worlds. He has no associate; and that have I been commanded, and I am the foremost among those that obey." With such a faith can internment or prison or even death have any terrors for a Muslims that truly believes?

I have already written at great length, but I cannot close this letter without expressing my opinion about your proposal to take my sons' case to the High Court. I am afraid I know nothing of law and have had no experience of it to guide me. But my sons have had some experience of it, and I have among their friends and in our legal adviser, Mr. Ghate, those who both know it and have gained considerable experience in the manner in which it works. They tell me that the merits of my sons' case will not be permitted to be discussed in any court, and the reference to the High Court will have to be confined to the legality of the Defence of India Act itself which the Viceroy's Council had passed. I would have welcomed an open trial in a properly constituted court of impartial judges, though I know what fearful effect the excitement of such a trial would have on the already shattered health of Mohamed Ali. But at best law is only the rich man's game, and it may ruin the richest of us when his adversary's expenses are paid from the public exchequer. You have with your characteristic thoughtfulness and generosity opened a fund for legal expenses and have contributed to it from your own purse also. But I frankly ask you, is it worth it? Do you think our rulers would leave the matter there even if we secured a decision against them? Even if we came to share your belief that the Viceroy and his Council would gladly release my sons if the war were not at its present critical stage, is it conceivable that, holding as they do such views about the war and the effect of my sons' release on its fortunes, they would quietly see them released merely because a High Court held that they themselves had no power to deprive them of their liberty? And would they let such a tremendous power so easily slip from their hands and

see everyone of the thousand odd Indians now rotting in confinement regain their liberty? Would not the British Parliament be asked to validate the Defence of India Act or itself pass another of the same kind for India?

This is however, for you and those who know these things at first hand to think about and decide. But to my mind what is of far greater urgency is the collection of funds for another purpose, namely, the relief of the interned and their dependents who are suffering so terribly from the worst effects of this hateful law. Day after day, one hears heartrending tales of the pain and suffering of the interned, whom Government had taken care to deprive of their liberty, including the power to earn a livelihood for themselves and their families, but whom it had apparently forgotten to provide with any subsistence allowance or, at least, an allowance adequate for their needs. Even cases of suicide in such circumstances have been reported. I repeat what I wrote to our dear brother Sir Subramanya Iyer. Can nothing be done to provide money for these unfortunate men, and their still more unfortunate relatives whose innocence at least could never have been in question? I can judge from our own experience of the last 2½ years, with entirely inadequate allowance to live upon, how great must be the constant strain of want in the case of those who are not so fortunate as ourselves, for we at least possessed some property that could be disposed of in case of urgent need, and have besides a large number of friends to relieve every want the moment they come to know of it. Apart from financial relief, there is a world of encouragement in the thought that, although you are alone in your exile, your fellow-countrymen who are still free and blessed with comforts, and even luxuries, are not indifferent to your fate. My heart goes out not only to the score of Muslims, mostly religious leaders or students of our sacred books, the sufferings of whose dependents are from time to time chronicled in the Urdu Press, but also to the hundreds of Bengali youths who have been interned in all sorts of places, and some of whom, confined in solitary cells have now resolved upon a perpetual fast. Is it not a blot on our patriotism that even after nearly 3 years of the rigorous working of a hateful Act we have no organisation that maintains a record of all interned persons, of the places where they are interned, of the directions in

which their liberties have been restricted, of the additional restrictions imposed, for the most part without any reason being assigned, of the subsistence allowances fixed for them, of the families they have to maintain thereon, and of the additional assistance they need to keep up anything like the standard of living to which they were used before their internments, but which is, so far as we can judge, habitually ignored by Government in fixing their subsistence allowances. The maintenance of such a record, the collection of funds for the relief of the interned and their families, including the proper education of their children, the provision of such legal assistance as they may need to make any representations to Government, and generally keeping in touch with them with a view to cheer them up in the abnormally depressing conditions of internment and exile, and to save them from the abuse of authority by local officials who are sometimes even more incensed against them than the Government that interned them, and are constantly desirous of imposing further restrictions by means of executive interpretation and secret official pressure on the people of the locality—these seem to me most urgenty called for, and I cannot think that there are any insurmountable difficulties in the way of creating and maintaining such an organisation. Along with this we may, of course, take such steps as we think proper to secure the release of the interned, whether by appealing to the law courts or to the Executive itself, or to the British Parliament and public, or by appealing to our own people to share the sufferings of the interned in their hundreds of thousands. As I have said, my sons are luckily able to get such assistance as they need; but others are not equally fortunate, and it is particularly to them that we should extend a helping hand. They have not figured prominently in public life, and while we agitate for the few public men that have suffered for their public activities, these men, unknown to fame, are apt to be forgotten, although perhaps their sufferings are even greater, and no less undeserved.

There is one more matter to which I should like to make if only a passing reference. It is to the harrowing incidents connected with the last *Id* sacrifices that took place in the districts of Shahabad, Gaya and Patna. They have naturally made a very deep impression on the Muslims of India: deeper,

in fact than is, I fear, generally realised. I, however, feel sure that you grieve no less than I do over the terrible sufferings of Muslims, men and women and the insults to our faith. While I feel all this very keenly, as I must do, in one way I am glad that these incidents occurred when they did. They have shown but too unmistakably how much we have still to do to root out the religious prejudices that have so long retarded the progress of the country, and have provided our adversaries with an excuse for denying to us mastership in our own house. We must not be content with what we have accomplished, but work on with a will to make the recurrence of similar incidents impossible, specially when, unlike the present times, we are at last solely responsible for the prevention of such disorder. While relieved to find that in the midst of mutual recrimination our people are not neglecting the most pressing need of the moment, namely, the relief of scores of thousands who have neither money nor food, nor sufficient clothing, nor even a home to call their own, I wish more could be done in this direction.

One thing, however, fills me with pride, for I rejoice to note that even such harrowing incidents have not been permitted by my co-religionists to impair their faith in the ultimate unity of Indian interests, or to weaken their determination to achieve without further delay a position and status for India among the nations of the world that have long been her due. Howsoever interested partisans, pretending to speak in India's name and for her dumb millions, may try to hide the truth from the Secretary of State, whom we welcome in our midst, and howsoever, much they may endeavour to screen the reality by choosing for him whom he may see and whom he may not, surely he cannot fail to realise the intensity of patriotic feeling that has, in spite of such sudden provocation, kept the best elements among the Muslims firmly in the path that they had chalked out for their community after much anxious care and deliberation. The manner in which they have withstood the shock of these exceedingly disturbing events illustrates better than all else what they feel for their country as a whole without ceasing to feel for their own community. That is why I say I am in one way glad that these incidents, terrible though they were, happened when they did. They are not the first fruits or even a foretaste of Home Rule, but the concomitants

of the existing absence of popular responsibility, and I pray and hope that the wise determination of the Muslims to pursue their ideals undisturbed by these events may soon be rewarded with the attainment of that complete freedom and plenitude of responsibility for the well-being and progress of their country which constitute the best guarantee of peace and order and perfect toleration...

I shall only add that this letter has been written with the assistance of Mr. Ghate. He has been in intimate touch with us for more than two years now, and has full knowledge of our affairs. I am constrained to explain this, as a communication that I sent to the Press last September has been incorrectly considered by Government to have been composed by my sons, and they have been threatened with the imposition of additional restrictions if they repeated an offence that they had never committed. Had they been free I would naturally have availed myself of their assistance ; but since they are not, I have turned more than once to Mr. Ghate, as you know. All the same, it amuses me not a little to think how fearfully incompetent we poor *purdanashin* women are believed to be. It is true that women of my age did not go to schools and colleges ; but then education has not always been imparted in such institutions, nor is all education confined to them even today. There are within my own knowledge many women who, like myself, have had to shoulder through their widowhood very early in life the burdens that properly belonged to men, and yet not a few of them discharged their novel duties with great credit to themselves and advantage to their children. I do not understand what there was in my simple statement of last September that placed its composition outside the competence of a distinguished University graduate and practising lawyer like Mr. Ghate, to whom I took great pains to explain all that I wanted to be stated, also finally making sure that it was done. It is perhaps forgotten that it was their poor *purdanashin* mother that had the sole guidance and supervision of her sons' education when fate left them to her as helpless little mites, that even today she is the mistress in the house, and that in all their more important undertakings at least they never act before consulting her.

Well, if they are destined to suffer still more because their mother who shares their enforced exile has not voluntarily

cut herself off altogether from the world outside Chhindwara, neither they nor I could help it, though it would be some consolation to them to think that, whereas previously new restrictions had been imposed without any attempt at justification or any reason being assigned, and all their own caution and care had not been able to protect them against such exercise of authority, this time they had suffered vicariously for their poor old mother, and knew the offence for which they were punished. Whether their sufferings are on account of their faith, as Government is clearly giving us to understand, or on account of their country, in serving which they incurred the displeasure and risked the malice of those who monopolise power, and in whose hands mainly lies the decision whether they should be released or remain interned, I pray, and also ask you to pray, that God would grant them the strength to endure to the end, and whether the end be near or remote, I fully believe that "Victory belongs to Right, Justice, and Truth." We await it with confidence, and in the meantime seek assistance, as we Muslims are asked to seek it, in patience and prayer.

Glossary*

Figures in parenthesis indicate the page numbers in the text

Alilamer Minkum [sic] (249) Al'amr Minkum—lit : 'the authority and command is from you' ; reference to the Prophet's tradition (*hadith*) of obedience to those in authority.

Amal bi-l-ma'roof (275)—to act according to what is recognised (as lawful); also *Al'amr bi-l-maroof*, a phrase derived from the Quran describing the attributes of pious Muslims; lit : commanding for what is recognised as lawful.

anjuman (153)—an association, e.g., *Anjuman-i-Khuddam-i-Ka'aba* (Association of the servants of Ka'aba).

Ansar (121)—'the helpers', title of the believers of Medina who received and assisted the Prophet after his *hijrat* from Mecca, e.g., Abu Ayyub Ansari [121] (592-672), an ancestor of Dr. M.A. Ansari.

bhabi (255)—a brother's wife.

bhaiyya (22)—a brother.

chaukidar (91)—a guard.

dar ul-harb (181)—'the abode of war' ; territory not under Islamic law and where Islam is under constraint.

dar ul-Islam (181)—'the abode of Islam'; territory where Islamic law prevails.

da'wat-i-waleemah (88)—a feast after the marriage (*nikah*) ceremony.

dheela (94)—loose ; thus *dheela pygama* (94).

dindar (140)—a person of religious faith or vision as opposed to *duniyadar* or wordly wise.

*Dr. Muzaffar Alam of the Centre for Historical Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, was of much help in preparing the glossary.

fatwa (141)—generally a written opinion on a point of Islamic learning given by a *mufti* or an *alim* (pl : *ulama*) of standing.

fidae (162)—generally a religious votary.

ghee (92)—butter oil, butter ; clarified butter.

gup (188)—gossip ; thus *bazaar gup* (189).

hakeem [hakim] (59)—a doctor practising one of the orthodox systems of Muslim medicine.

haram [harem] (228)—name of the sacred area of the two cities of Mecca and Medina as well as that of Jerusalem ; also, *Harmain-i-Sharifain* (155).

hara'am [haram] (235)—forbidden by the sacred law ; anything that is not forbidden is called *halal*.

hijrat (233)—act of migration from persecution to safety ; especially of the Prophet Mohammad from Mecca to Medina in A.D. 622, the starting point of the Islamic era.

Id (55)—*id-al-fitr*, festival at the close of Ramazan (104).

jagir (93)—a tenure in which the revenues of a given tract of land were made over to a servant of the state, together with the powers to collect and appropriate such revenue, and administer the jagir.

Jazirat-ul-Arab (145)—'the island of Arabia', the area bounded by the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, the Indian Ocean, the Persian Gulf, and the Tigris and the Euphrates.

jehad [jihad] (140)—'An effort, or a striving'. A religious war with the 'unbelievers' and an incumbent religious duty.

jullabi (82)—one who is constipated.

Ka'aba (156)—the cube-like building in the centre of the mosque at Mecca.

Khadim-i-Harmain-i-Sharifain (155)—servant of the sacred area of Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem. The Sultan of Turkey was the *Khadim*, and bore the responsibility of defeating the area.

khiraj [kharaj] (95)—a tax, a tribute on land.

khutba (177)—the sermon delivered on Friday at the time of *zuhr*, or meridian prayers, or at Muslim festivals like *Id*.

Mohtamim (141)—Rector ; Principal ; head of a religious seminary.

Mujahid (275)—a warrior in the cause of religion ; a crusader.

murabbi (58)—benefactor, patron.

Nahy'an il-munkar (275)—to refrain from the unlawful.

Nazarat-ul-Ma'arif (144)—a Quranic school established in Delhi by Ubaidullah Sindhi.

Niwar (78)—a cotton woven strip used in making beds.

purdanashin (207)—one who observes *purdah* (186) or remains secluded from male adults outside the family.

Porus ka Haathi (207)—'the elephants of Porus' who caused the rout of their own army in the battle against Alexander.

Qasas (87)—'the narrative' ; also, the title of the Quranic *Surah* in which Moses is said to have related the *narrative* of his adventure with God.

qibla (143)—the direction in which all Muslims must pray, whether in their public or in their private devotions, namely, towards Mecca.

qurqi—a decree issued in case of insolvency.

rasagoolah—a sweet made of cheese.

Roshni-i-Tabah (207)—enlightened.

sabiqoon-al-awwaloon (87)—'the first and the foremost' generally referred to the early followers of the Prophet, e.g., Ali, Fatima, and Abu Bakr.

salaam (87)—safety, peace, salutation, greeting, compliments ; *Salam-o-Alaikum* (90), Peace be with you.

sandesh (219)—a sweet made of cheese.

sari (*saree*) (94)—a dress consisting of one piece of cloth worn by women round the body and passing over the head.

satyagraha (253)—'possessed by the truth' ; commonly used to denote the passive resistance movement of Gandhi.

shaidais (144)—votaries, fans.

shahadat-i-sharia (140)—witness in accordance with the *sharia*.

shalwar (94)—trousers, breeches, pantaloon.

swadeshi (235)—of one's own country ; indigenous.

swadharma (235)—one's duty, generally religious duty.

swaraj (117)—rule over self ; self-government ; political independence.

thana (19)—a police station.

tehsil (19)—a sub-division of a district.

tughra (84)—prefixed to letters, diplomas, or other public deeds written in an ornamental style or hand ; a sort of writing ; monogram, cipher.

wajib (181)—incumbent.

Yaum-ul-Hisab (285)—'day of judgement', 'day of reckoning'.

zenana (80)—lady's section in a household ; *zenana* is a Persian adjective derived from the word *zan*, "a woman".

Index

ERRATA

P. 3 line 1 f.n. 1 *for* aunched *read* launched
P. 30 line 7 from below *for* Khurshid *read* Khurshed
P. 31 line 13 from below *for* impose *read* imposed
P. 34 line 20 *for* Bambooque *read* Bambcoq
P. 57 line 13 *for* v *read* have
P. 141 line 9 from below *for* jihad *read* jehad and elsewhere
P. 201 line 19 from below *for* Masud *read* Masood
P. 204 line 7 from below *for* an *read* and
P. 281 line 14 *for* Cleavland *read* Cleveland and elsewhere
P. 281 line 7 *for* W.M. *read* W.H.
P. 302 line 13 f.n. *for* O.B. *read* O.S.